

bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Susan Garner, administratrix of the estate of William F. Garner, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RYAN: Petition of J. D. Layng Division, No. 421, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WEBB: Papers to accompany bill for relief of Willard V. Shepherd—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary E. Morris—to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 25, 1905.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SCOTT, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. HALE. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it be to meet at 1 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. PENROSE presented the credentials of PHILANDER C. KNOX, chosen by the legislature of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator from that State to fill the vacancy in the term ending March 3, 1905, caused by the death of Matthew S. Quay; which were read and ordered to be filed.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask that the oath be administered to Mr. KNOX.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator-elect will present himself at the desk and the Chair will administer the oath required by law.

Mr. KNOX was escorted to the Vice-President's desk by Mr. PENROSE, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. PENROSE presented the credentials of PHILANDER C. KNOX, chosen by the legislature of the State of Pennsylvania a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read, and ordered to be filed.

Mr. ALGER presented the credentials of JULIUS C. BURROWS, chosen by the legislature of the State of Michigan a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1905; which were read and ordered to be filed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 17769. An act to grant certain lands to the Agricultural and Mechanical College of Oklahoma for college farm and experiment station purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. J. Res. 164. Joint resolution for the printing of a compilation of the laws of the United States relating to the improvement of rivers and harbors, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR QUAY.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I give notice that on Saturday, February 18, after the routine morning business, I shall present resolutions commemorative of the life, character, and public services of my late colleague, Hon. MATTHEW STANLEY QUAY.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CLAPP presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Brainerd, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. WETMORE presented a petition of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, R. I., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution relative to the granting of divorces; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, R. I., praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sending through the mails of all gambling devices, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Providence, R. I., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all buildings, ships, and grounds used by the United States Government; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. BURNHAM presented the petition of G. W. Buzzell, of Nashua, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the extension and improvement of Massachusetts and Boundary avenues, NW., in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of Concord Division, No. 335, Order of Railway Conductors of Concord, N. H., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of Portsmouth, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend sections 4886 and 4887 of the Revised Statutes relating to patents on medicinal preparations; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of the National Association of State Dairy and Food Departments of Lexington, Ky., praying for the passage of the so-called "pure food bill;" which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the legislature of the Territory of New Mexico, remonstrating against the admission of the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona into the Union as one State; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. C. S. Carpenter and thirteen other widows of army officers, residents of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation to authorize the readjustment of the accounts of army officers in certain cases; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of Jere E. Chadwick Post, No. 70, Department of New Hampshire, Grand Army of the Republic, of Deerfield Center, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to modify and simplify the pension laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of Concord Division, No. 335, Order of Railway Conductors, of Concord, N. H., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Washington, D. C., praying for the establishment of a juvenile court and hospital in that city; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the American Federation of Musicians, praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the salaries of members of the United States Marine Band; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also presented the petition of G. W. Buzzell, of Nashua, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the extension and improvement of Massachusetts and Boundary avenues, in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Political Study Club, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for compulsory education in the District of Columbia, and also to regulate the employment of child labor in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. ANKENY presented a petition of the Alaska Club, of Seattle, Wash., praying for the repeal of the present wholesale liquor license law now in operation in Alaska; which was referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of the Bar Association of Oakland, Cal., praying for the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of San Francisco, Cal., praying that an appropriation be made providing an additional tug for the revenue service at that port; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. TELLER presented a petition of Royal George Lodge, No. 59, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Pueblo, Colo., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Grand Junction, Colo., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Grand Junction, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry army nurses of Longmont, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of army nurses of the civil war; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lamar, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the enlargement of homestead entries in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Commandery of the State of Colorado, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, of Denver, Colo., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the efficiency of the permanent military establishment of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Colorado Springs, Colo., praying for the ratification of international arbitration treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. DOLLIVER presented a petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of Waterloo, Iowa, and a petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of Keokuk, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the patent laws of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Commercial Club of Kenyon, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of W. J. Stoneburner Lodge, No. 339, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Two Harbors, Minn., praying for the passage of the employers' liability bill; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Brainerd, Minn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of C. Summers Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Minnesota, of Canby, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to modify and simplify the pension laws of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Norman and Polk counties, Minn., remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Sauk Center Fire Department Relief Association, of Minnesota, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for national supervision of the insurance business; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. ALLISON presented petitions of F. S. Catlin, of Mason City; of M. O. Waterbury, of Mason City; of the Retail Druggists' Association of Blackhawk County, and of the Pharmaceutical Association of Davenport, all in the State of Iowa, and of the Retail Druggists' Association of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to amend the patent laws relating to medicinal preparations; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented a petition of Fortress Lodge, No. 171, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Fort Dodge, Iowa, and a petition of Local Lodge No. 27, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Corn Belt Meat Producers' Association, of Dallas County, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the memorial of George Swisher, sr., and 12 other citizens of Madrid, Iowa, and the memorial of J. W. Pines and 18 other citizens, of Madrid, Iowa, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Co-

lumbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Commercial Exchange of Des Moines, Iowa, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the manufacture, sale, and use of grain alcohol free of revenue for certain industrial purposes; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of Welcome Grange, No. 551, Patrons of Husbandry, of Robeson, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Wyoming Valley Division, No. 160, Order of Railway Conductors, of Wilkesbarre, Pa., praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the congregation of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Dorranceton, Pa., remonstrating against the repeal of the present anticanteen law; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the board of directors of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Pittsburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish a pneumatic-tube service for mail delivery in the cities of Pittsburg and Allegheny, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of the quarterly conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Minersville, Pa., and a petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Hollidaysburg, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation referring all international disputes and controversies to a permanent court of arbitration; which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented memorials of the congregation of the Presbyterian Church of Zellenople, of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Shenandoah, and of the session of the Second Presbyterian Church of Pennsylvania, all in the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "statehood bill;" which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of York, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Annville, Montoursville, Pittston, and Bonair; of Washington Camp, No. 176, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Windsor, and of Washington Camp, No. 464, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Alderson, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to restrict the immigration of aliens into the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present the affidavit of Dr. W. S. Allee, of Olean, Mo., in support of the bill (S. 5995) granting an increase of pension to Emma A. Porch. I move that the affidavit be referred to the Committee on Pensions for consideration in connection with that bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL presented petitions of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, of the Cotton Exchange of St. Louis, and of the Board of Trade of Kansas City, all in the State of Missouri, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HOPKINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, Moline, and Rockford, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of a new trade-mark law; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also presented petitions of Egyptian Division, No. 512, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, of East St. Louis; of the Railway Employees Twentieth Century Club of Chicago, and of Woodlawn Lodge, No. 451, Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen, of South Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the passage of the so-called "employers' liability bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Grand Crossing and Chicago, in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reorganization of the consular service; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the memorial of L. A. Schnell and 47 other citizens of Noble, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the closing on Sunday of certain places of business in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented memorials of Local Union No. 409, Cigar Makers' International Union, of Kewanee; of the Chicago Leaf Tobacco Association; of Sternfeld & Danner, of Chicago, and of J. Friedman & Co., of Chicago, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against any reduction of the duty on tobacco imported from the Philippine Islands; which were referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, La-salle, East St. Louis, and Quincy, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the enactment of legislation to enlarge the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McENERY submitted sundry papers to accompany the bill (S. 6751) for the relief of Nancy C. Thompson; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE G. RUGGLES.

Mr. McCUMBER. I present a statement, being the military record of George G. Ruggles, late brigadier-general, United States Army. I move that the statement be printed as a document, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13332) granting a pension to Honora Sullivan; A bill (H. R. 13330) granting an increase of pension to Michael Kelly, alias Patrick Kelly;

A bill (H. R. 9769) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Pershing;

A bill (H. R. 13105) granting an increase of pension to William F. Gaut;

A bill (H. R. 16234) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin H. Hartman; and

A bill (H. R. 14908) granting an increase of pension to Henry Leib.

Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6507) granting an increase of pension to James J. Champlin;

A bill (H. R. 9550) granting an increase of pension to William Butler;

A bill (H. R. 10342) granting an increase of pension to William W. Marple; and

A bill (H. R. 8834) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Richardson.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 10558) referring the claim of Hannah S. Crane and others to the Court of Claims, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CULLOM, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6744) relative to the commissions of officers who are under the direction and control of the Postmaster-General and the Secretary of Commerce and Labor, respectively, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. Knox on the 13th instant, proposing to appropriate \$1,500 for salary of consul at Port Deitrick, Nicaragua, intended to be proposed to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. PETTUS, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, submitted a report in relation to the useless papers in the Post-Office Department.

Mr. ALGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 12795) granting an increase of pension to John L. Lee;

A bill (H. R. 12601) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Prill;

A bill (H. R. 12820) granting an increase of pension to Isabella Bryson; and

A bill (H. R. 7097) granting an increase of pension to John White.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 11018) granting an increase of pension to William B. Bruner;

A bill (H. R. 10948) granting an increase of pension to John N. Matthews;

A bill (H. R. 10387) granting an increase of pension to Aaron C. Perry;

A bill (H. R. 11847) granting an increase of pension to James B. Croly;

A bill (H. R. 11499) granting an increase of pension to Albert Jones;

A bill (H. R. 12155) granting a pension to Nancy Hill;

A bill (H. R. 12090) granting an increase of pension to William R. Clark;

A bill (H. R. 12007) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. K. Lockman;

A bill (H. R. 8395) granting an increase of pension to James Duffy;

A bill (H. R. 8208) granting an increase of pension to Burleigh C. D. Read;

A bill (H. R. 5995) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Fulton;

A bill (H. R. 9140) granting an increase of pension to James L. Capp;

A bill (H. R. 8839) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Hicks;

A bill (H. R. 9062) granting a pension to John Goodspeed;

A bill (H. R. 6702) granting an increase of pension to James Slater;

A bill (H. R. 6957) granting an increase of pension to Alexander C. Bowen;

A bill (H. R. 8423) granting a pension to Joseph Hepworth;

A bill (H. R. 13640) granting an increase of pension to Eugene Hepp;

A bill (H. R. 13324) granting an increase of pension to John Kesler;

A bill (H. R. 13419) granting an increase of pension to George Weeks;

A bill (H. R. 12255) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Gudgell;

A bill (H. R. 12252) granting an increase of pension to James Baremore, alias James Baker;

A bill (H. R. 12171) granting an increase of pension to John Davis;

A bill (H. R. 7350) granting an increase of pension to John C. Besier;

A bill (H. R. 7760) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Pierce;

A bill (H. R. 9410) granting a pension to Rosa Miller;

A bill (H. R. 7252) granting a pension to James M. Garrett; and

A bill (H. R. 9065) granting an increase of pension to Albert Z. Norton.

Mr. McCUMBER (for Mr. FOSTER of Washington), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13377) granting an increase of pension to Albert R. Straub; and

A bill (H. R. 12660) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Russell.

Mr. CLAPP, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. Nelson on the 11th instant proposing to appropriate \$4,926.67 to compensate the owners of the Norwegian steamship *Nicaragua* for damage incurred by reason of the rescue of an American citizen, John McCafferty, and the consequent quarantine of said ship at Mobile, Ala., in 1894, intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, reported it without amendment, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. TALIAFERRO, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13546) granting an increase of pension to Joel J. Addison;

A bill (H. R. 8477) granting a pension to John W. Guest;

A bill (H. R. 13547) granting an increase of pension to Lewis J. Parr; and

A bill (H. R. 8476) granting a pension to Rolan J. Southerland.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14622) prohibiting the selection of timber lands in lieu of lands in forest reserves, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14710) authorizing the use of earth, stone, and timber on the public lands and forest reserves of the United States in the construction of works under the national irrigation law, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the

bill (S. 4429) relating to the creation of forest reservations on the public domain, and for other purposes, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11370) to relieve the Italian-Swiss Agricultural Colony from the internal-revenue tax on certain spirits destroyed by fire, reported it without amendment.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6644) to authorize the President of the United States to cause certain lands heretofore withdrawn from market for reservoir purposes to be restored to the public domain, subject to entry under the homestead law, with certain restrictions, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

ADDITIONAL LAND OFFICE IN UTAH.

Mr. KEARNS. I am directed by the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6707) creating an additional land office in the State of Utah, to report it favorably without amendment, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read to the Senate for its information.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the bill lie over, as I have not had time to consider it. I ask that it may go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the bill goes to the Calendar.

W. R. AKERS.

Mr. WARREN. I am directed by the Committee on Claims to report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 3950) for the relief of W. R. Akers, of Alliance, Nebr. It is a bill proposing to pay seventy-odd dollars, and as it requires amendment I ask for its present consideration.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to pay to W. R. Akers \$79.50, to reimburse and satisfy him for that amount paid by him for the Government to W. G. Buehner for his salary as contest clerk in the United States land office at Alliance, Nebr., for salary for a one-quarter service in the year 1902.

Mr. WARREN. I shall move that the preamble, which is surplusage, be stricken out. That renders it necessary that the words "the said," before the name W. R. Akers, in the body of the bill, in line 5, be stricken out.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment striking out the words "the said," in line 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read the third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the preamble be stricken out.

The motion was agreed to.

MONUMENT TO CAPT. CHARLES VERNON GRIDLEY.

Mr. ALGER. I introduce a bill which I ask may be read at length. There is a letter accompanying it, forwarded to me by the President, which I am sure will appeal to Senators. I ask that the letter may also be read.

The bill (S. 6860) providing for the erection of a monument in Arlington Cemetery to the memory of Charles Vernon Gridley, late captain, United States Navy, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be constructed and placed in Arlington Cemetery a suitable granite monument to the memory of Charles Vernon Gridley, late captain, United States Navy, and the sum of \$5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary for the purpose herein specified, is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No objection being made, the letter accompanying the bill will be read.

The Secretary read the letter, as follows:

President ROOSEVELT.

MY DEAR SIR: I presume you are aware that there is a bill before Congress for the erection of a monument in Arlington in memory of my good son, Capt. Charles Vernon Gridley, who commanded the *Olympia* (Admiral Dewey's flagship) at Manila, his death being due to services thereon during the battle.

There appears to be need of special influence to make this a law, which influence I hope you will be disposed to lend if it seems right to you, as it is my earnest prayer that I may live to see this monument erected. I trust you will appreciate a mother's keen interest in the perpetuation of the memory of her brave son. Then, too, his son (my only grandson) was killed on the U. S. S. *Missouri*, and the monument could answer for both father and son.

I feel that I am not asking too much, for both died for their country. Neither would I ask it if I had the means to erect this monument myself; but I am at present, at the age of nearly 80, a clerk in one of your Departments working for my living.

Our Michigan friends would rejoice if I should be successful, as that was our home, and the other States would be glad.

Most respectfully, yours,

ANN E. GRIDLEY.

1511 T STREET, WASHINGTON, D. C.,
January 7, 1905.

Mr. ALGER. I move that the bill and accompanying letter be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 6861) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Burbank; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6862) to correct the military record of L. F. Jackson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 6863) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shoup; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. LONG introduced a bill (S. 6864) for the establishment of an additional recording district in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BURROWS introduced a bill (S. 6865) to appropriate and pay the balance due the loyal Creek Indians on the award made them by the Senate of the United States on February 16, 1903; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 6866) granting an increase of pension to George C. Sackett; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SMOOT introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

A bill (S. 6867) to provide the manner of opening for settlement and entry and for disposing of certain lands in the Uintah Reservation in Utah;

A bill (S. 6868) to provide for setting aside certain timber lands on the Uintah Indian Reservation, in the State of Utah, as a national forest reserve, and the sale of timber and wood thereon; and

A bill (S. 6869) to provide for the relief of Indians if land to which they have a color of title has been or may hereafter be appropriated by act of Congress for the public use.

Mr. SMOOT introduced a bill (S. 6870) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver old pieces of ordnance to the Utah Indian War Veterans; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 6871) providing for the resurvey of a township of land in Colorado; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. McCREARY introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 6872) for the relief of Madison County, Ky.; and

A bill (S. 6873) for the relief of the estate of R. G. Potter.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 6874) providing for the establishment of a district court of the United States for China and Korea; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 6875) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to make an examination of certain claims of the State of Missouri; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 6876) granting an increase of pension to Alonzo M. Bartlett; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FORAKER introduced a bill (S. 6877) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Loomis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BAILEY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 6878) for the relief of Cooper Walker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCUMBER introduced a bill (S. 6879) granting an increase of pension to E. S. Miller; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BARD introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 98) to print a second and revised edition of the Third Annual Report of

United States Reclamation Service; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Printing.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment providing that all officers of the Navy below the grade of rear-admiral and all officers of the Marine Corps below the grade of brigadier-general, with creditable records, including those naval officers retired with the relative rank of commodore, who served during the civil war and who were honorably retired prior to the passage of the act of March 3, 1899, entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States," may be advanced on the retired list one grade above the grade or rank now held by them, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment providing that any allotments which may be made of the Osage Reservation in Oklahoma Territory shall be made subject to the terms and conditions of a certain lease dated March 16, 1896, given by the Osage Nation of Indians to Edwin B. Foster, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLAPP submitted an amendment proposing to strike out the provision relating to the issuance of patents in fee in mixed-blood adult Indians to whom trust or other patents have been issued, containing restrictions upon alienation, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TELLER submitted an amendment providing for the payment from the annuities of the Cheyenne Indians of the sum of \$7,740 to Jarib L. Sanderson, of Boulder, Colo., being the amount found by the Court of Claims to be the losses sustained on account of depredations by a band of said Indians in the summer of 1864, intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. STONE submitted an amendment providing that any allotted lands, except the homesteads of members of the Five Civilized Tribes, that may be subjected to overflow by reason of the construction of any water power in the Indian Territory may be purchased by the owners of such water power, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FORAKER submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the extension of the pneumatic-tube service under the direction of the Postmaster-General from \$500,000 to \$800,000, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the post-office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FULTON submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for investigation of methods of extraction of the mineral values of the black sands of the Pacific slope from \$50,000 to \$75,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELKINS submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$90,000 for Ambrose Channel light vessel, New York; \$125,000 for Ambrose Channel light-house, New York, and \$15,000, for Ambrose Channel tank light vessel, New York, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. NELSON submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the salary of consul at Christiania from \$2,000 to \$2,500, intended to be proposed by him to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. OVERMAN submitted an amendment authorizing the Court of Claims upon final determination of such case to ascertain and determine the amount to be paid the attorney and counsel of record for the Cherokee Indians by blood, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Indian appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

STATISTICS RELATING TO COTTON.

Mr. BAILEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 185) authoriz-

ing and directing the Director of the Census to collect and publish additional statistics relating to cotton; which was referred to the Committee on the Census, and ordered to be printed.

RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CLAY submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate:

First. The amount paid each year to the railway companies for the purpose of carrying the United States mail since 1873.

Second. The total number of pounds of mail carried each year by the railway companies since 1873.

Third. The pay per mile per annum per hundred pounds for carrying the mail each year since 1873.

Fourth. How often the mails are weighed to ascertain the average weight of the mails carried, and how the Post-Office Department obtains the average weight.

The Postmaster-General is specially directed to inform the Senate if, under the present law, the average weight of mail can be ascertained without the knowledge of the railway companies carrying the same, and without giving such companies an opportunity to increase the weight of the mails when such average weight is being ascertained by the Post-Office Department.

Fifth. How long the present prices to railway companies for carrying the mail have been paid, and what reductions have been made since 1873; if any have been made, to specify in each instance what the reduction has been.

Sixth. To furnish to the Senate all the facts going to show how long the present prices for carrying the mails have been continued, and to give the Senate, if he has such information in his possession, any fact that will go to show that a reduction in present prices can be made.

AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN POWERS.

Mr. TELLER. I submit a resolution to be printed and lie on the table.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That it is the duty of the Senate of the United States to adhere to, support, and firmly maintain its right of participation in every agreement, treaty, or convention entered into with any foreign power that has the effect of law under the Constitution of the United States; and every such agreement that is not submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent, or that is not ratified by a vote of two-thirds of the Senators present and constituting a quorum of the Senate, is not obligatory as the supreme law upon the Government, the States, or the people of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will lie on the table and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. C. R. McKENNEY, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 16790. An act making Norwalk, Conn., a subport of entry;

H. R. 17333. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across Red River at Shreveport, La.;

H. R. 17488. An act to extend the time for the commencement and completion of a bridge across the Missouri River, at or near Oacoma, S. Dak.;

H. R. 17749. An act authorizing the Kensington and Eastern Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Calumet River; and

H. J. Res. 206. Joint resolution to provide for the removal of snow and ice from the cross walks and gutters of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17094) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LITTAUER, Mr. MARSH, and Mr. TAYLOR managers at the conference on the part of the House.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 17094) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. PERKINS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments to the bill and agree to the conference asked for by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WARREN, and Mr. DANIEL were appointed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 16790. An act making Norwalk, Conn., a subport of entry;

H. R. 17333. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across Red River at Shreveport, La.;

H. R. 17488. An act to extend the time for the commencement and completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Oacoma, S. Dak.; and

H. R. 17749. An act authorizing the Kensington and Eastern Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Calumet River.

REMOVAL OF SNOW AND ICE IN THE DISTRICT.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 206) to provide for the removal of snow and ice from the cross walks and gutters of the District of Columbia was read the first time by its title.

Mr. ALLISON. As that joint resolution refers to a matter of pressing moment, I will ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to have it considered at this time, and not ask its reference to the Committee on Appropriations, where it would naturally go.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution just received from the House of Representatives, which will be read the second time at length.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of \$5,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the removal of snow and ice from the cross walks and gutters in the District of Columbia; one half of said sum to be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half out of the Treasury of the United States.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask unanimous consent to call up House bill 17473, the army appropriation bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 17473) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that it be read for action on the committee amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont asks that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments shall first receive consideration. The Chair hears no objection, and that order is made. The bill will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was under the subhead "Pay of officers of the line," on page 5, line 15, to increase the appropriation for the pay of officers of the line from \$5,000,000 to \$5,369,240.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 18, to increase the appropriation for the pay of officers for length of service, to be paid with their current monthly pay, from \$900,000 to \$1,000,000.

Mr. TELLER. I wish the bill could be read with a little more deliberation and a little less noise in the Chamber, so that those of us who want to follow it may be able to do so. Do I understand that we have dispensed with the reading of the bill? Some one says that we have dispensed with the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The formal reading only was dispensed with. It is being read, by unanimous consent, for action on the amendments, and the Chief Clerk has been reading the whole of it. The only complaint that anybody could make probably would be that he is a pretty rapid reader, which I regard as a virtue.

Mr. TELLER. I am not making any particular complaint.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment on page 5, line 18, has just been reached.

Mr. TELLER. I feel that I am under some obligation to know at least what the bill contains by the time it passes, although I do not suppose I shall have any particular influence upon the bill in any way. I should like to know what the bill contains.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Engineer Battalion," on page 6, line 4, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty-seven" and insert "thirty;" and in the same line, before the word "dollars," to strike out "five hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

Additional for length of service, \$30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster's Department," on page 6, line 14, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixteen thousand" and insert "nineteen thousand two hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

Additional pay for length of service, \$19,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Subsistence Department," on page 6, line 20, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixteen thousand" and insert "nineteen thousand two hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

Additional pay for length of service, \$19,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Hospital Corps," on page 8, line 7, before the word "thousand," to strike out "four" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

Additional pay for length of service, \$125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading was continued to line 21 on page 9.

Mr. HALE. Before we go to the next paragraph, I wish the Senator from Vermont would tell the Senate what officer is covered by the provision in lines 19, 20, and 21, page 9.

For pay of officer in the Adjutant-General's Department, \$7,500.

Is there any officer in the Adjutant-General's Department who gets \$7,500 a year?

Mr. PROCTOR. Major-General Corbin, the Adjutant-General.

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to the provision, but why is phraseology used which is so general, "for pay of officer?" There is nothing in that language which indicates that provision is made for a major-general. Why not put in terms what it is for? It might apply to any officer.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think there is no objection to that phraseology. It is well understood. This office was provided for by a special provision in an appropriation act, with the proviso that when General Corbin left the service the office should cease. All the other officers of the Adjutant-General's Department were put under the Record and Pension Division. It is well understood that this provision applies only to General Corbin. There is, however, no objection to specification, if there is any doubt about it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I am not driving at General Corbin, who is a very able and good officer, and this is not too much money to give him, but it struck me as rather anomalous legislation that an appropriation, which purports to be in detail, covering the rank and grade of officers, should use this language:

For pay of officer in the Adjutant-General's Department, \$7,500.

That might mean any officer.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator kindly give me the page from which he is reading?

Mr. HALE. Page 9, lines 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. SPOONER. How many officers are there in the Adjutant-General's Department?

Mr. PROCTOR. One.

Mr. HALE. The Adjutant-General's Department as we knew it, so far as that officer standing as he did before, does not now exist. If this is the only officer that there is in the Adjutant-General's Department as it remains, after that great office has been, as I say, dismantled and the provision applies only to one officer of this rank, I am not particular about the military officer who is referred to being named.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is all there is left, Mr. President. The amount named in the bill is the pay prescribed by law for a major-general.

Mr. HALE. It is one of the results of these newfangled schemes under which the Army is running that the old Adjutant-General's Department, which was simple and plain, and whose relation to the Army was very well understood, has been stricken out. The large power in the War Department, including most of the power that the Secretary ought to exercise, has been dumped into what is called the General Board, which is to-day the War Department. One result is that all that is left of the Adjutant-General's Department is this single officer, who

is a remarkably good officer and a very valuable man, one of the best informed and able and capable of the generals here in Washington or anywhere else in the Army.

I see now, what I did not see when I arose, that this provision, which looks vague and uncertain, is not so in the mind of the Senator from Vermont or in that of the Department, but that it is the result of this new scheme, by which the power and responsibility of the Department is transferred from the civilian side to the General Staff, which cuts out everything in the Adjutant-General's Department except General Corbin.

Mr. PROCTOR. If a change in language will be more satisfactory to the Senator from Maine, I see no objection to changing it so as to read:

For pay of the Adjutant-General of the Army.

Mr. SPOONER. Is there any such officer any longer?

Mr. DANIEL. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PROCTOR. General Corbin has the rank of major-general until the office expires.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, we do not hear the conference that is going on among Senators on the other side.

Mr. HALE. I do not insist on a change being made, Mr. President, as General Corbin is the only officer in that Department.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly.

Mr. DANIEL. I desire to ask the acting chairman of the Military Committee if there is not an assistant adjutant-general, General Hall, in the Adjutant-General's Department?

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, under the law General Hall and the other officers of that Department were transferred to the Record and Pension Division, but they are still named as assistant adjutants-general. I think it would be wise to change the name as provided by law, as it will be changed when these officers go out of office, to the Military Secretary's Department.

Mr. HALE. The officers who have been performing the general duties relating to actual military service heretofore, as I understand it, are now transferred to the Record and Pension Division.

Mr. WARREN. To the Military Secretary's Department.

Mr. HALE. The acting chairman of the committee has said that they have been transferred to the Record and Pension Division. I was going to ask whether their time and services are devoted to the examination of records, of papers, of files, and applications for pensions, because the term "Record and Pension Division" would seem to indicate that they had been taken from the Adjutant-General's Department and the duties of that Department and transferred to the examination of records and pensions, and that they are busy now in rather the musty work that is done there, for instance, examining the old files of pensions, and all that. Will the Senator explain that to the Senate?

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I used the term "Record and Pension Division" because that was the old name by which I had known it and which had been used so long. The proper name is the Military Secretary's Office. The duties of those officers who have been transferred to and made part of the Military Secretary's Bureau are not changed at all. That is the record division of the Army, which attends to the correspondence of the Army and the reports.

Mr. HALE. Then, as I understand it, the Record and Pension Bureau has blossomed into the Military Secretary's Department, under the lead of that distinguished soldier, General Ainsworth, who has semicivilian duties, but belongs to the fighting corps. Is that correct?

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, there is no change in the duties of the officers who have been in charge of the old Record and Pension Division. They continue performing just the same duties. Those who come under the Military Secretary's Office have been transferred from the Adjutant-General's Department and are performing the duties heretofore performed by the Adjutant-General's Office.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but, with his permission, I will read the provision of the statute passed last year, April 23, 1904, on that subject, under the head "Adjutant-General's Department":

That the officers of the Adjutant-General's Department, except the Adjutant-General, and the officers of the Record and Pension Office shall hereafter constitute one department of the Army, to be known as the Military Secretary's Department.

Mr. SPOONER. If I live for the next four years I do not expect during that time to master the mysteries of the legislation in regard to the General Staff; but as I understand the

law, Major-General Corbin is still Adjutant-General of the Army. I do not know that that is so, but I suppose it is, and that he is the only adjutant-general in the Army.

Now, I suggest to the Senator from Vermont, in order, if possible, to rescue this provision from the charge of being rather absurd, and to remedy its indefiniteness, whether it would not be well to say:

For pay of the Adjutant-General of the Army, \$7,500.

Mr. TELLER. That is what it ought to say.

Mr. SPOONER. Possibly that would pull some of the stones from this buttress. I am not sufficiently familiar with the situation to know whether it would or not, but the Senator from Vermont is.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I think there is no objection—I certainly see none now—to that proposed change of language.

Mr. SPOONER. As the language in the bill reads "For pay of officer," it might mean a second lieutenant. If it be agreeable, I will move to strike out the words "officer in the Adjutant-General's Department" and insert in lieu thereof, "the Adjutant-General of the Army."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The amendment proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 9, after the words "pay of," at the end of line 19, it is proposed to strike out "officer in the Adjutant-General's Department" and insert "the Adjutant-General of the Army;" so as to read:

For pay of the Adjutant-General of the Army, \$7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I believe the bill is now being read for amendment. I desire now to offer an amendment, on page 31, by striking out the word "fifteen," in line 21, and inserting "ninety." I simply offer the amendment now because one of my constituents has just sent it to me with a request that I shall offer it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment intended to be proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] will lie on the table until the portion of the bill to which it relates has been reached.

Mr. BAILEY. I simply desire to have the amendment pending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and lie on the table for the present.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 10, line 5, after the word "Provided," to strike out:

That when a vacancy shall next occur in the office of Assistant Chief of the Record and Pension Office such vacancy shall not be filled and said office shall then cease and determine.

And to insert:

That hereafter vacancies that shall occur in the office of Assistant Chief of the Record and Pension Office shall be filled by appointments from captains of the line of the Army.

Mr. PROCTOR. I should like to have that amendment passed over for the present. I think the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] wishes to propose a modification of it, and he is not now in the Chamber.

Mr. HALE. I was going to ask that myself, and I am glad the Senator from Vermont has agreed to have it passed over, as it is a very important provision and will give rise to debate.

The reading of the bill was resumed at line 12 on page 10 and continued to the end of line 18 on the same page.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I observe that the Adjutant-General's Department has only one officer now, and he is not serving in that department or in the Military Secretary's Department, as it is called. We have \$91,500 worth of officers on duty there. I should like to inquire if these are purely military officers of the United States who are engaged in the Military Secretary's Office, and what kind of officers are on duty there?

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, there are in the Military Secretary's Office all the officers who had been permanently appointed in the Adjutant-General's corps, except the Adjutant-General. There are also quite a number—I should say about ten or twelve officers—detailed for duty in that department. The law providing for filling vacancies in the Adjutant-General's Department, which was passed before the transfer, applies to this department. There has been no permanent appointment made, except to fill one place, which is covered by the amendment which has been passed over.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I have no criticism to make upon what has been done by law. That, of course, has got to be respected in an appropriation bill, but appropriation bills drafted after the fashion of this bill, and perhaps some other appropriation bills, impart to the minds of those who pass upon

them very little glint as to what they are doing. On the eighth and ninth pages of this bill we find:

One laborer at \$480 per annum.
One laborer at \$660 per annum.
Two messengers at \$600 each per annum.
One clerk at \$720 per annum.
Two clerks at \$900 each per annum.

There are many other items of that kind which indicate to the mind exactly what are the services of the persons employed and what they are to be paid for. But when we come to a great department—the Military Secretary's Department—we appropriate in lump \$91,500 and get no information from the bill itself as to what is to become of the money, except that it goes to the pay of officers there. As to whether the officers are detailed there, or on regular duty there, or what their rank is, the smallest possible information is imparted to the body that is undertaking to make specific appropriations. Those who have to pass upon such a bill, too, have no method of any reformation, if they have one in mind, unless they have previously sifted the statutes themselves, or sifted the estimates themselves, or sifted the official relations for themselves.

It seems to me that a body which is charged with the expenditure of large sums of public money ought to have a more specific statement of what it is they are asked to do. I am not criticising the Senator who has charge of this bill. This bill comes from another body. I do not know that any criticism can be fitly made as to what seems to have become a sort of custom with us of appropriating money after this fashion; but it is through this manner of appropriation that we sometimes find processions of carriages appearing to have been appropriated for when nobody knew it at the time the subject was being considered. I do not mean as to this specific item, because it confines itself to one topic—the pay of officers. Of course the offices must exist. These limitations apply, of course, to the items, but the rank of the officers, the service in which the officers are engaged, even their general nature is not hinted at by this bill. So it becomes extremely difficult to ascertain whether one is voting for a proper thing or not. I simply call attention to this fact now, for I have not had opportunity to inform myself, nor do I know that the papers relating to the matter would afford information if I saw them.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, there has been no Army Register issued for the present year, but in the Register for last year, beginning on page 9, the Senator will find the names and rank of all the officers who are employed in this department, and in the estimates for this year he will find the same. They are: One major-general, one brigadier-general, five colonels, seven lieutenant-colonels, sixteen majors. Under the detail law no permanent appointments have been made since that law was passed. There are, I think, remaining only one brigadier-general—Brigadier-General Hall—five colonels, and two lieutenant-colonels. I think I am right in that. The remainder of the officers are detailed officers, serving for a four years' term, unless promotion in their regiments or something else shortens their detail. When the end of the detail comes they go back to their regiments, and other officers are detailed in their places.

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, I am much obliged to the Senator for such information as he has given. I understand the Military Secretary's Office is not a part of the General Staff. The General Staff is rendering the military services of the Army. That is one thing. Are the subordinate officers under the Military Secretary in the General Staff of the Army?

Mr. PROCTOR. They are not; but are entirely distinct.

Mr. DANIEL. That was what I understood.

Mr. SPOONER. I should like to inquire of the Senator who constitute the General Staff?

Mr. PROCTOR. I have not the list just at hand. General Chaffee is at the head of it.

Mr. SPOONER. But how many officers are there?

Mr. PROCTOR. I can not tell the Senator without a reference to the list. There are quite a number coming from every department—the Quartermaster's Department, the Commissary Department, and others, representing all the different departments of the Army.

Mr. DANIEL. I was about to inquire, further, what five colonels of the Army, sixteen majors of the Army, and the lieutenant-colonels of the Army have to do in the office of a mere secretary who is keeping the papers of the Army, and is not connected either with service in the field, with the artillery, the cavalry, the infantry, the Quartermaster, the Commissary, or the Adjutant-General's Department, or with the Staff? I understand that so many colonels, lieutenant-colonels, and majors are at desks dealing in civilian work, such as any clerk in a store has to deal with, without connection with the Army that does the military work of the country.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I will respond to the Sena-

tor's inquiry. The Military Secretary's Department is the department of information and correspondence. All the business that has heretofore been done through the Adjutant-General's Office now goes through that office, and, in addition to that, the record and pension business. I think it is a measure in the interest of good business management and economy. It is really a consolidation, and there is always economy in consolidated business management.

Mr. TELLER. I want to ask the Senator who has the bill in charge, the acting chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, who compose this force of the office of the Military Secretary? Are they civilians or are they officers of the Army?

Mr. PROCTOR. They are all officers of the Army, with the exception of Lieutenant-Colonel Tweedale, whom the Senator knows very well. He had been for a long time chief clerk in the War Department. By a special provision of law the President was authorized to make an appointment from civil life. The authorization was given, I presume, with Mr. Tweedale in view. He was appointed and is now an officer of the Army. But there is only that one place open to appointment from civil life.

Mr. TELLER. As I understand, these military officers are doing clerical work.

Mr. PROCTOR. No more than the officers of the Adjutant-General's Bureau always have done. They have, of course, a very large force of civilian clerks.

Mr. TELLER. In addition?

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. Several hundred.

Mr. PROCTOR. The force of clerks of the Adjutant-General's Office and of the Record and Pension Division have been transferred to the office of the Military Secretary.

Mr. TELLER. The reason I made the inquiry is that I was not aware that it was the policy of this Government to put military officers, as a rule, into clerical positions. I supposed they were to be with their regiments in the field, if there was any necessity for it, or wherever their regiments might be.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator will remember that we have taken men from military places and placed them into clerical positions. Why not place military officers in clerical positions?

Mr. TELLER. In this army business, I want to say that for some years we have done so many wonderful things, so many extraordinary things, and such unheard-of things, and I want to add, so far as I am concerned, things that are inexplicable and not understandable, that I can not comprehend this new system. I could get along pretty well with the old system—I served for a little while on the Committee on Military Affairs some years ago—but I do not know anything about this new system.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, officers have not been assigned to clerical duty any more than they have always served to a small extent in such capacity in the Adjutant-General's Office. Every one of those officers is likely to be called into the field at any time or assigned to any other duty. They are strictly military officers.

The reading of the bill was resumed at line 19, page 10, and continued to the end of line 12, on page 13.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the proviso which has just been read applies to officers now assigned to active duty?

I will read it:

Provided, That hereafter no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty, receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer so as to make his total pay and allowances exceed the pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think it would after this measure goes into effect.

Mr. LODGE. That is my understanding. I read it in the same way.

I regret very much, Mr. President, that the committee of the Senate has not seen fit to strike out this proviso. It seems to me, in the first place, that if such a provision is to be made it ought to apply to all officers. As a matter of fact, the officers retired in the younger grades are generally, not always, men who are retired because of injury received in the service and who are more or less physically disqualified for any active duty, whereas many of the officers who retire at the head of the list by operation of law, at the age of 62 or 64, are thoroughly competent to perform active duties and to be of great value in certain positions such as those to which, under recent legislation, we are able to assign retired officers in connection with the State militia.

It seems to me it is a mistake to single out general officers for legislation of this character. I do not think the legislation is needed as a whole. I do not think that men who have served all their lives in the Army of the United States have

been so overpaid that if they receive active duty elsewhere after retirement we need grudge them receiving the full active pay. Elsewhere there has been a very sharp debate upon this clause, and public attention has been much drawn to it.

I have tried to state, Mr. President, my general objections to it. I think it is needless. I think it is ungenerous as a general proposition. I think, more than that, that as it is framed it is unjust. It ought to apply to all or it ought to apply to none. If we are too poor to allow retired officers assigned to active duty their full pay, there is no reason for cutting it off at the rank of major.

But there is another objection in my mind, Mr. President, which I think is a very unfortunate circumstance. It has been stated freely that this clause was suggested by and was aimed at the case of the late Lieutenant-General of the Army, who has been assigned to duty with the militia in my State. He is an officer of great distinction, who served in the civil war in all grades of the service. Under the existing legislation he received an appointment to the militia of Massachusetts, and under that law he was entitled to his full pay as Lieutenant-General. No doubt it is high pay; but if he is in the performance of active duty it seems to me there is no reason for legislating against him, and especially for indulging in retroactive legislation.

If it is considered good policy to prevent retired officers from receiving full pay when they obtain or are placed upon active duty, that is another question; but I do not think it is becoming or desirable to pass legislation of this kind with a retroactive effect, aimed, as this apparently is aimed, at a specific officer.

I regret very much the introduction of the legislation. I regret still more that the Senate committee has not seen fit to modify it in such a way that it would cure the evils, if evils exist, without striking at individuals; and I hope, Mr. President, that it will be stricken from the bill. I move to strike out the proviso.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would state to the Senator from Massachusetts that the order of the Senate was that the committee amendments should be first considered. Therefore, unless by unanimous consent—

Mr. LODGE. Very well. I am aware of that arrangement, and I have no desire to ask unanimous consent. At the proper time I shall move to strike out the proviso. But when the proviso was reached in the reading of the bill, it was of course in order to discuss it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will lie on the table until the committee amendments are considered.

Mr. PROCTOR. Let it be passed over now, if the Senator asks for it.

Mr. LODGE. If it is desirable to discuss it, we can discuss it at this point as well as any other.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, I wish we might have an explanation, as we are on the proviso, as to exactly what it means, for I have not knowledge of these matters.

Mr. LODGE. I can tell the Senator what it means very easily. Under the law as it now exists a retired officer may be asked for by the governor or other authorities of a State for assignment to duty in connection with the militia of the State.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Is that the only duty to which he can be assigned?

Mr. LODGE. No; I am only explaining the one which is particularly aimed at.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator allow me? Why does the Senator say the particular one aimed at? There is no one mentioned in the proviso, and I, as a member of the committee, object to having that construction put upon the proviso.

Mr. LODGE. It was a matter of open debate elsewhere, and it was admitted that that is what brought it on.

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. It was admitted that it was aimed at officers—not one officer—who have taken militia service with the States, and it was stated on the floor, though no names were given, that there was an unseemly scramble among retired officers to get this militia duty, when they would receive full pay.

It is idle to say it is not aimed at those officers. It was admitted in debate that it was aimed at them, and the chairman of the committee stated there that the amendment was induced by the unseemly scramble of general officers who had been retired to get militia duty in the States.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will allow me for a moment, I think his last statement is correct, but he said one officer, as I understood him.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no.

Mr. SCOTT. As I understood him, that the report of the committee and the action of the House were directed against

one special officer. I simply wanted to state that that is not correct.

Mr. LODGE. I said, in reply to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]—the Senator from West Virginia misunderstood me—that this was aimed at officers who were seeking or had received militia appointments under the law. In my previous remarks I said it was generally believed that the amendment had been suggested by, if not aimed at, the case of one particular officer who had taken service with the State militia. I did not say the committee aimed it at him. I said it had been suggested that the amendment was so aimed.

The clause did not originate here, but it was aimed at that officer, and I stated that his was the case which started it. But there was no dispute about the fact that it was aimed at general officers and officers above the rank of major who have taken service with the State militia.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, the law authorizing the assignment of these officers to certain duty and giving them full pay is a provision found in the appropriation act of last year, and is as follows:

The Secretary of War may assign retired officers of the Army, with their consent, to active duty in recruiting, for service in connection with the organized militia in the several States and Territories, upon request of the governor thereof, as military attachés, upon courts-martial, courts of inquiry, and boards, and to staff duties not involving service with troops; and such officers while so assigned shall receive the full pay and allowances of their respective grades.

The provision in the present bill applies to officers assigned to duty in connection with the organized militia in the several States and Territories upon the request of the governor thereof.

Now, in regard to the purpose of this provision—

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator excuse me? I think, without intention, he has narrowed the meaning of the proviso. It applies to any active duty. The exciting cause was undoubtedly the assignment to militia duty.

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. But it applies to retired officers assigned to any active duty.

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly. The Senator is correct in that respect. But it especially applies to these.

Mr. LODGE. Unquestionably.

Mr. PATTERSON. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee how many retired officers will be affected by this provision?

Mr. PROCTOR. I am not able to tell the Senator just how many. The number is constantly varying. They are constantly being assigned to that duty. I know there are applications now pending. I have been informed, and I think it is correct, that the number of general officers so assigned is now in the teens—thirteen or sixteen. I do not remember just the number.

Mr. PATTERSON. The Senate adopted a resolution day before yesterday calling for that information, but I suppose it has not yet been responded to by the Secretary of War.

Mr. CARMACK. I have heard that the number was nine. I do not know whether that is correct or not.

Mr. PROCTOR. I listened to a discussion—to use the language of the celebrated Sampson Brass in locating his friend Quilp after his supposed death, "it was somewhere or another"—in which the number was stated as I have given it, and it was not disputed. I have not myself called on the Department for the information. I know there are applications now pending. There is one in my own State, from a general officer, asking for the detail. I do not think it has been decided yet.

Mr. CARMACK. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly.

Mr. CARMACK. I will say that is the number given by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, as I find by the RECORD.

Mr. COCKRELL. What number?

Mr. CARMACK. Nine. He gives the names.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. As the Senator from Wisconsin said a few moments ago, if I should be permitted to live to serve out my term, I do not expect that any amount of study which I may give to the subject will enable me to understand the mysteries of our army organization. I do not think any layman can master them. But the reason why I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to this clause is that it seems to me to be very obscure or it must perpetrate an injustice. I will read it:

That hereafter no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty, receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer so as to make his total pay and allowances exceed the pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

A brigadier-general, I understand, gets as retired pay something like forty-one hundred dollars.

Mr. PROCTOR. Forty-one hundred and twenty-five dollars. Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes.

Mr. PROCTOR. And in addition commutation for quarters.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. No matter about that; \$4,125. That is the pay of a brigadier-general on the retired list. A major may get something like thirty-six hundred dollars, and there is a difference of \$500.

Suppose that a brigadier-general was assigned to active duty on a court-martial, as he may be, does this cut down his total pay and allowances to the pay of a major, which is about thirty-five or six hundred dollars? It seems to me it does; and therefore I hope that when this matter is to be discussed for amendment the proviso will be carefully examined to see if I am right.

Mr. PROCTOR. I have no question that the Senator is right. Whenever a retired officer is assigned to active duty he can receive no more pay than the pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. How unjust that would be.

Mr. WARREN. I do not agree with the construction of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. How unjust it would be, if a retired brigadier-general should be called upon to serve on a court-martial, that he is to have his pay reduced \$500 for doing it.

Mr. WARREN. Certainly, if that construction is correct, the bill should be corrected, for that is not the intention, and to me it is perfectly plain that that would not be the law. Now, it reads:

That hereafter no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty, receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer.

The law presumes there that he gets his retired pay, which the statute gives him. Of course he will draw that pay, no matter what we do.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Senator is right about that. I was hasty in my statement.

Mr. WARREN. That is, if he is of a rank where the maximum retired pay would be less than that of a major when on active duty, he gets additional compensation, but not exceeding the pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

Mr. LODGE. That is precisely as I understand it.

Mr. BERRY. That is right.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is right.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. As I said, I do not quarrel with the interpretation, because I confess that I am not able to understand these matters. But I wanted to call attention to it so that there should be no question about it hereafter.

Mr. WARREN. I think it is well that attention should be called to it and that our understanding of it should be known, because there is no evident intention on the part of the Senate, and surely none was shown on the part of the House, to molest or interfere with the regular retired pay.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I understand this proviso as the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] understands it, and I think it is rather a cowardly way of enacting a prohibition practically of the assignment of any retired officer to active duty above the rank of major. Every proposition, however general it may be, if it touches a hundred officers and includes General Miles, is regarded by General Miles and others as being specifically aimed at him. On principle the provision seems to me to be an indefensible and unjust one. Whether it was intended, or is intended, which I can not for one moment believe, to reach the case of any particular officer, it effects a large number. We provide for the voluntary retirement of an officer at 62. He may be at his best mentally; he may be, in fact, at his best physically. He may not be at his best physically, but there may never have been a time in his career when he could render better service to the Government than when he reaches 64, the age for compulsory retirement.

Mr. TELLER. The President may retire him at 64?

Mr. SPOONER. At 64 he is compulsorily retired. And he may have years before him during which he could be, if opportunity were afforded, of the utmost utility to the Government, because of his character, his long experience, and his peculiar aptitude for the discharge of certain duties.

So I think the provision which was contained in the last appropriation act authorizing the assignment of retired officers, with their consent, to active duty was a wise one and a humane one—wise that it permitted the Government to secure the continued service, as long as the mental and physical condition of the officer rendered it practical, or as the Government needed it, of these men of experience; a humane one in that it gives to these men who have devoted their lives to active work in a

profession the opportunity to continue as long as they may, if they wish to do so, in the same lines of thought and activity.

The duty to which they may be assigned is limited.

And the Secretary of War may assign retired officers of the Army, with their consent, to active duty in recruiting, for service in connection with the organized militia in the several States and Territories upon the request of the governor thereof, as military attachés, upon courts-martial, courts of inquiry and boards, and to staff duties not involving service with troops; and such officers while so assigned shall receive the full pay and allowances of their respective grades.

Why not? If a retired officer is assigned, with his consent, to a court-martial, why should he not receive the same compensation and allowances from the Government that any other officer of the same grade on the active list receives for performing the same service? If he is assigned to duty upon any board which may involve matters of grave importance to the Government and great labor upon his part, why should he not receive the pay, while doing active duty, of an officer of his rank on the active list? If he is assigned to staff duty, I should like to have the Senator from Vermont tell me why he should not, while discharging that duty, be entitled to the pay of any other officer of the Army of his rank discharging the same duty? He is rendering the service; he is assigned to that service because of his fitness and his experience, and why should he not have the pay? And if he is assigned to service with the militia of a State why should he not have the pay of his rank on the active list? He is not serving simply a State. In the last analysis he is serving the United States.

The Constitution makes it the duty of Congress to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia. It is the militia in the various States which is the last and greatest resort of the Government in time of stress and peril. No army officer can better serve the country in time of peace than in aiding the constitutional policy of training the militia of the States, so that they may be fitted, when called into active service, for the efficient discharge of the duties of soldiers. And the more eminent the officer, the longer his career, the greater his rank and his record for valor and success as a commander, the greater his ability to impress himself and the lessons which he teaches out of his experience and his knowledge upon the officers of the militia. This proposition, as I understand it, if put into law, does away with this provision of the existing law.

Mr. TELLER. It repeals it.

Mr. SPOONER. It repeals it. The words "active duty" are used in the existing law and the words "active duty" are used in this proposed act. They are used in the same connection and they will be construed to have been used in the same sense. They are not words of technical signification. They are words as to the construction of which there could be little difference of opinion. Under this proposed act, as I understand it, a general officer assigned to staff duty with his consent, assigned to duty with militia in the States upon the request of a governor, assigned to recruiting duty, assigned to any of the duties permitted by the existing law, could not draw higher pay than the pay of a major.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think the Senator will see that he is mistaken in that view. I was for the moment deceived by it, but I think if he will read it carefully he will see that the officer can not receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer. It does not cut down the pay of any retired officer.

Mr. SPOONER. That is not the way that I read it.

That hereafter no retired officer—

Of course he receives a certain pay as a retired officer. If he is put upon active duty under the existing law he simply receives the pay of an officer of his rank not retired. Is not that true?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; active pay.

Mr. SPOONER. Full pay.

That hereafter no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty, receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is perfectly plain. There is no question about it. General Miles would receive three-fourths of his pay, and so would every one of them. There can be no earthly question on that point.

Mr. SPOONER. That is just the point I am making. Let us see whether that is so. I had not finished.

That hereafter no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty, receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer so as to make his total pay and allowances exceed the pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

The first clause of this provision deals entirely with officers above the rank of major.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator from Wisconsin allow me?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I do not appear here as the originator of this proposition, nor do I wish to say that I would have supported it in its first or embryo state, but—

Mr. SPOONER. It is in its embryo state now.

Mr. WARREN. The intention of the provision is perfectly plain to me. It applies to general officers and, in some degree, to field officers. Colonels and lieutenant-colonels would receive some additional pay under this provision, because the full pay and allowances of a major on the active list are larger than the retired pay of a lieutenant-colonel and about the same or a little more than that of colonel. In fact I think a colonel retired would receive a little addition in pay because of commutation of quarters under this act, as it is expected to apply.

Mr. SCOTT. As we understood it in committee.

Mr. WARREN. Of course I approach law questions with great deference to the judgment of those who are more learned in the law than I am, but when a law as to retired officers' pay has been applied almost since the foundation of our Government it can not be difficult to construe. The term "pay of retired officer" is well known. And when we here say that he shall not receive any addition to his retired pay it certainly means that he shall draw his full retired pay.

Mr. SCOTT. That is it.

Mr. SPOONER. If that were all there is of it, that would be true.

Mr. WARREN. The language here evidently intends that a lieutenant-colonel shall receive a part of the difference between the retired and active pay, because he shall be permitted to have so much additional to his retired pay as will make his pay while on detail equal to the active pay and allowances of a major.

Mr. HALE. It does not apply to general officers?

Mr. WARREN. It does not apply to general officers, because their retired pay would be larger than the full pay of a major on the active list.

Mr. SPOONER. It applies to officers above the rank of major.

Mr. WARREN. I understood the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Wisconsin to say that a general officer of the Army, retired, could draw only the active pay of a major under this proposed measure. I think that a wrong construction of the law.

Mr. SPOONER. Now, let me read it again:

That hereafter no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty, receive from the United States any pay or allowances—

Mr. WARREN. "Additional."

Mr. SPOONER (reading)—

additional to his pay as a retired officer, so as to make his total pay—

Mr. WARREN. But that refers to additional pay.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator says it does; I think it does not. That is not the ordinary construction of words.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator will allow me to interrupt him for a moment, I can suggest what I, at least, have understood about it by giving an illustration. A lieutenant-colonel is entitled when on the active list to \$3,000 a year, with an additional percentage, under certain circumstances, according to time of service.

A major is entitled when on the active list to \$2,500. If the lieutenant-colonel goes on the retired list he is put on three-quarters pay, which would be \$2,250. If he were then to get a detail he would be allowed additional pay beyond the retired pay to the amount of \$250, which would give him the full pay of a major on the active list. That is what I understand the provision to mean. So a lieutenant-colonel would get something additional, but no higher officer would, because the three-fourths retired pay would be equal to the pay of a major on the active list.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will permit me, all officers who retire after twenty years' service are entitled to 40 per cent extra. So 40 per cent of \$3,000 in one case, and 40 per cent of \$2,500 in the other, would be added.

Mr. FORAKER. I referred to the fact that under certain circumstances they got an additional percentage, but eliminating that, for the sake of the illustration, it would be as I have given it.

Mr. SPOONER. I ordinarily, Mr. President, have been able, at least I have so thought, to see a point if it was plain enough; but I do not see it yet. I am not challenging at all the intention of this provision. It looks to me as if the provision were a contradiction.

Mr. CARMACK. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. SPOONER. I yield to everybody.

Mr. CARMACK. At the first glance I took the same view of

the provision the Senator from Wisconsin does, but I think that both he and I were mistaken about it. The reading of the proviso is that he shall not "receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer."

Mr. SPOONER. That I understand. But that is not all it says.

Mr. CARMACK. It is intended only to affect the pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer. If as a retired officer he is already receiving pay or allowances equal to or greater than the pay of a major on the active list, he gets nothing at all.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is the meaning of it, clearly.

Mr. SCOTT. That is the way the committee understood it.

Mr. FORAKER. I think we all agree that the language is not very fortunate; that it is not the clearest which could be used.

Mr. CARMACK. He would get the pay of a major on the active list.

Mr. FORAKER. If the Senator from Wisconsin will bear with me just a moment, I wish to say, while I am on the floor, that I agree with him about the provision; that is, I do not favor it. I am on the Military Affairs Committee, but I did not happen to meet with them when the bill was considered. Perhaps I was on other duty. I share the feeling the Senator from Wisconsin has expressed in regard to the proposed legislation. I believe an officer who is on active duty should not be discriminated against as that would discriminate against him.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I still do not read this as it is read by many here. I think there will be great trouble about it.

Mr. WARREN. Let me suggest that I do not think anyone will object to an amendment that will make it more certain.

Mr. SPOONER. If it is absolutely certain now there is nothing needed to make it more certain, but to me it is very obscure, at least as I read it.

Mr. PERKINS rose.

Mr. SPOONER. I wanted to add only a word.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let me make a suggestion to the Senator in charge of the bill. The only ground upon which any question can arise is on account of the use of the words "so as to make his total pay and allowances exceed the pay and allowances of a major on the active list." Strike those words out and it leaves it beyond any question that every retired officer above the rank of major will draw his full retired pay.

Mr. PATTERSON. And no more.

Mr. COCKRELL. And no more.

Mr. SPOONER. That is clear.

Mr. COCKRELL. I make that suggestion to the chairman of the committee—to strike out the words "so as to make his total pay and allowances exceed the pay and allowances of a major on the active list." Then there can be no question about it.

Mr. PROCTOR. The trouble with that, I think, is just this: The retired pay of a lieutenant-colonel is not equal to the full pay of a major, while the retired pay of a colonel is precisely the same. The purpose of that last clause is merely to save the lieutenant-colonel.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then no lieutenant-colonel will apply for a detail under the provision, and that will end it.

Mr. SPOONER. And, of course, no officer above him. Is it the intention of this provision that if a retired brigadier-general is assigned to active duty he shall receive the pay of his grade on the active list?

Mr. PROCTOR. The intention is plainly that a brigadier-general—

Mr. SPOONER. Not plainly, but what is the intention?

Mr. PROCTOR. The intention is, I think, without any question, that he shall receive his retired pay, and of course he would receive commutation of quarters, because he will be away from an army post.

Mr. SPOONER. Then it is the intention to repeal the provision of the existing law, and that is what I thought, which is that such officers so assigned shall receive the full pay and allowances of their respective grades.

Mr. SCOTT. Of course it would repeal that provision. That was the understanding of the committee.

Mr. SPOONER. What is the theory upon which an officer fit for duty, who is assigned by the Secretary of War with his consent to the discharge of active duty, shall receive less than an officer of his grade not retired who is discharging the same duty? Is it because the man has served longer? Upon what principle of justice is that supported?

Mr. PROCTOR. I agree fully with the Senator from Wisconsin in my desire that the officers on the retired list shall have full justice. I am the responsible author of the provision

which authorizes their detail. It had been for many years the policy of the War Department to oppose any act which would authorize the placing of retired officers on active duty. I had favored such a measure because I thought there was much of this duty that they could do quite as well. Objection was made, I know, when the act was framed last year, that we ought not to authorize the detail of officers of high rank to active duty; but it seemed to me that we might have important courts or commissions where officers of high rank would be required.

As I understand the purpose of this measure, the cause which led to its introduction was the claim that it was being abused; that a large number of retired general officers were asking governors of States for duty with the militia, and that they were really not so desirable for that duty, because heretofore almost always lieutenants or captains, younger men, have been detailed, who would be better in touch with the National Guard. It was considered that it was a little unseemly that there should be such a scramble for this detail, which would give full pay and commutation of quarters in addition.

In my State, for example, I know we have only one regiment, and I have had very earnest letters from several officers and their friends asking me to request the governor to give them a detail there. There is only one regiment. The service of such an officer (and we have sometimes had one detailed) would be largely with a single company, going about to the different towns where a company was raised. It was the opinion of the committee that a younger officer, a captain, perhaps, who had just been in close touch with his company command and who was familiar with all parts of company duty and drill, would be more useful.

STATEHOOD BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont will suspend for a moment. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 14749) to enable the people of Oklahoma and of the Indian Territory to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States; and to enable the people of New Mexico and of Arizona to form a constitution and State government and be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is perfectly agreeable. I was going to make the same request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed with the consideration of the army appropriation bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, it was my purpose, and I had so indicated to the chairman of the Committee on Territories, that to-day I would discuss one phase of the statehood bill. I simply want to say that I will not attempt to seek an opportunity to speak to-day, but that to-morrow at 2 o'clock, if the unfinished business shall be under consideration, I will submit my remarks at that time.

CONSIDERATION OF PENSION BILLS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Vermont, that at 4 o'clock this afternoon we shall proceed to the consideration of unobjected pension bills on the Calendar. I simply want to say that there are now 288 pension bills on the Calendar, and a number of Senators are desirous of having them acted upon.

Mr. PROCTOR. I shall not object to that request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota asks unanimous consent that at 4 o'clock to-day the Senate will proceed to the consideration of unobjected pension cases on the Calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears none, and that order is made.

Mr. NELSON. I was about to say that I must object unless coupled with the request is the request that the statehood bill shall be temporarily laid aside for that purpose.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will be done at the time.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will do that.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17473) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906.

Mr. PROCTOR. Another reason which was urged for this

measure was that under the provision of the last session authorizing the retirement of officers on additional grade and giving officers who had already been retired and had served in the civil war an additional grade, a very large number of officers, (the aggregate now is over two hundred) are on the retired list as brigadier-generals. It was thought that on the whole we had done our full duty by retired officers of high grade, and that that measure, which it was claimed was being abused somewhat, ought to be changed.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I wish to make an inquiry. I understand that the appropriation bill which is under consideration is likely to take all the time until 4 o'clock and at that time the order of the Senate is that unobjected pension bills shall be considered for the rest of the day. I make the inquiry because I want to leave the Chamber if I can, and I wish to be here if the statehood bill is to come up in the meanwhile. Do I understand that the statehood bill has been laid aside for to-day?

Mr. SPOONER. The statehood bill is laid aside pending the consideration of this bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. Practically so, I think.

Mr. SPOONER. Of course, Mr. President, it is perfectly apparent that the object of this provision is to accomplish something indirectly which somebody did not wish to attempt to accomplish directly. It would have been perfectly easy to provide that no retired officers above a certain grade should be assigned to the active list. That is not done. The object of this provision as to the pay of retired officers assigned to the active list, with the limitation which is clearly put here, is to render it against the interest of any retired officer above a certain grade to consent to his assignment by the Secretary of War to duty on the active list. That is not fair to the Government; it is not a manly way to legislate; nor is it fair to the retired officers of the Army, a great many of whom are just as fit to discharge the duties of a soldier as a great many on the active list.

In order to meet one difficulty which the Senator from Vermont refers to, the assignment of general officers retired to militia service in States which have no militia to all intents and purposes, the wise rule, I think, enacted and inspired by the distinguished Senator from Vermont last year, is overturned. One officer has been assigned to the militia in Pennsylvania. That is an army well equipped, well disciplined. General McKibben, it has been said somewhere in the papers, asked for that detail. I am told by him—and he is an old friend of mine—that it is false. He is one of the most accomplished soldiers in the Army and is as well capable to discharge any of the duties of a soldier to-day as he ever was.

Now, why should not such a soldier, fit physically and mentally, splendidly qualified by long experience, not on the carpets here in Washington, but on the frontier and in battle, be assigned to the militia of Pennsylvania, or to the National Guard of my own State—and my State takes great interest in her National Guard—or to the National Guard of Ohio, or any other of these States?

What better service in time of peace, let me ask again, can a thoroughly equipped and trained soldier and officer render to the Government than to aid in preparing militia officers and enlisted men of the State by drill and training for the immediate and efficient discharge of the duties of the soldier when occasion demands it? And if detailed to that duty, why should he not have the pay which would belong to an officer of his grade on the active list.

I will tell you where there is a trouble which ought to be reached. It is one of the difficulties; and if there is any special attack on this bill that is the origin of it; and there may be ground for it, too. The rule has been that a retired officer of the United States detailed to a college or detailed for service with the militia should receive his full pay.

It was not probably contemplated that he should be paid a large salary by a State, so that he would be receiving not only his full pay, the pay of his grade on the active list, but also a salary of several thousand dollars a year from the State to which he was assigned. Is not that one of the things this amendment has attempted to correct? It might be corrected without the overturn of this constructive work of the Senator from Vermont in the last army appropriation bill, by deducting from the pay of the officer any sum he received from the State, so that he should not receive in the aggregate from the Government and the State more than the pay pertaining to his grade on the active list.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. PATTERSON. I would ask the Senator from Wisconsin

if there is anything in the law or in the rules of the Army that would prevent a State, when through its governor it applies for the detail of a retired army officer, from paying additional compensation?

Mr. SPOONER. No.

Mr. PATTERSON. As I understand it, under the militia act that was adopted a year or two ago, these details are only made on the request of the governor of a State; that upon the application of a governor of any State or Territory furnished with material of war, under the provisions of former laws of Congress, the Secretary of War may, in his discretion, detail one or more officers, and so forth.

I understand that in the case of the Lieutenant-General a tender was made to him of an appointment by the governor of Massachusetts with compensation from the State of Massachusetts; that he refused to accept it; and thereupon Governor Douglas made application for the detail of the late Lieutenant-General for service in the State of Massachusetts. It seems to me that when the governor of a State makes application for a retired officer to be detailed for services for the State, that he may improve the militia, that he may give to the organized forces of the State the benefit of his knowledge and experience, there is nothing whatever beneath the dignity of the officer to receive additional pay from the State, and surely it would be entirely proper for the State to pay for those services when they are rendered.

Now, so far as the pending provision is concerned, I am opposed to it in so far as it is retroactive, but I would favor it if it was made applicable to all officers detailed in the future, and if it would be in order—

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator interrupted me for a question.

Mr. PATTERSON. Just one word more and then I will be through, so that the Senator may have the benefit of my suggestion. If it would be in order to amend the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts, who moved to strike out the proviso, I would move that the proviso be amended so as to read as follows:

That no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major who shall hereafter be assigned to active duty shall, when so assigned, receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional, etc.

They would thereby be prohibited from receiving any pay from the United States not included in the proviso as it exists in the bill. It was very clearly the expectation of those who framed that proviso that a State, when it requested through its governor that some officer be detailed, should pay him, and if it did pay no objection would exist.

I will ask that my amendment may be considered as pending and as amendatory to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] was not in order at the time it was made. Therefore the amendment the Senator proposes to that amendment is not in order at the present time, unanimous consent having been given that the committee amendments should first receive consideration. As soon as they shall have been concluded the entire bill will be open to amendment.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I have only one word further to say. If it was the intention of the law as it now stands that an officer detailed to service with a State should receive the pay of his grade as if he were still on the active list of the Army of the United States, I doubt very much whether the law is right which permits an officer, detailed to service for a State, to draw from the Treasury, upon the theory that he is in the service of the United States—as he is really—his full active-service pay and as much again from the State. I doubt the policy, from more than one standpoint, of permitting officers of the Army on the retired list this double pay. I think it would be good legislation, if they be permitted to receive pay from the State at all, to deduct from the pay they receive from the United States that which they receive from the State.

Mr. PATTERSON. That is, over and above full pay.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; over and above full pay.

I want to add just one remark, which I have, I think, twice repeated, that it is not fair to deal with this subject only with reference to details to service with a State; that there is no justice, nor is there wisdom, in precluding the detail of retired officers for service on the staff in war or in peace, not service with troops, perhaps, but service on boards, to send them abroad or to serve upon military commissions, and impose upon them the functions for which they are fitted, although retired, but which are provided for in the law of last year, and yet to provide that while doing active duty they shall not receive the pay due to their grade on active duty. There is no justice in it.

Mr. BURROWS. And that they should receive less for active duty.

Mr. SPOONER. That they should receive less for active duty than an officer alongside of them, doing perhaps the same work, receives for the same duty. There is no justice in it. In attempting to accomplish indirectly one thing this proposition accomplishes too many things which, in my judgment, ought not to be accomplished.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I think that had it not been for the proviso in what is called and popularly understood as the "militia law," which provides for the detail of officers upon the request of the governor of a State, this provision would hardly have been inserted in the bill, because, as I understand it, independently of this provision, the services for which general officers are detailed are usually very short in duration—to serve on courts-martial and for temporary services of that character.

The pay of retired officers receiving full pay when detailed to service of that kind would be so inconsiderable that I doubt whether it would have been deemed necessary to have curtailed, by a provision of this kind, what they were in the habit of receiving. But where an officer is detailed at the request of the governor of a State it is understood to be for a very considerable length of service; it may be for a year, or two years, or three years, or four years, so long as the governor making the request is to be at the head of the affairs of the State, or even longer.

I imagine it was largely because of the long-continued additional pay that was made possible, if not probable, under the provisions of the late militia law that this proviso was inserted. Under those circumstances it seems to me that if it was not retroactive, with the right, if not the moral duty or the legal duty, resting upon the State to provide for all who rendered service to the State, this amendment is not to be severely criticised. It may be admirable, it may save to the Government a very considerable sum of money, while at the same time the detailed officers will receive as much as they were receiving when they were in active service.

It does seem to me that everything may be attained that is sought to be attained by so amending this proviso as to strike from it its retroactive effect and make it read so that it will not be applicable to officers already detailed, and who by reason of the detail are receiving full pay from the Government, who may have declined, as did General Miles, to receive additional pay from the State into whose service they entered.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator's proposition, it would be to confine this amendment to the officers serving in connection with the organized militia in the several States and Territories upon the request of the governor thereof, and in that way not changing the present law in regard to officers detailed on courts-martial.

Mr. PATTERSON. The wording of the proviso should be so changed as not to affect those officers already detailed, but only to affect those who will be detailed in the future.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, those are distinct propositions. I should have no objection whatever to the first proposition.

I wish to say, while I am up, if the Senator will allow me, that I am very sure there was no purpose or thought in the original preparation of this provision of hitting at any one person or officer; but the large addition of general officers to the retired list has caused a good deal of comment and great additional expense.

Mr. PATTERSON. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont, in that connection, that whether it was the purpose to hit any particular officer or not, the belief is pretty widespread throughout the country that it was aimed at one particular officer, and that is was only after that officer was detailed for such service that this change of law was attempted. If it is generally believed to have been aimed at one particular officer, the evil is just as great as though it had been in fact aimed at that particular officer.

There are now only between nine and thirteen officers detailed whom this proviso, in all human probability, will affect. Those officers have been detailed, as was the late lieutenant-general, without receiving any compensation from the State into whose service they temporarily entered, and it would be a manifest injustice to put a law upon the statute book that would change their status as to compensation. If those officers are allowed to fill out their details under the law as it exists at the present time, there can be no injustice in the future worked by a provision of this kind, because they will take the detailed service with the law staring them in the face.

It does seem to me, in view of the objection made by the Senator from Massachusetts that this provision is retroactive and necessarily changes in a very material and substantial way the status of officers already detailed, that this proviso ought not to be applicable to them. I believe the Senate would be willing

quite unanimously to allow the proviso to stand if officers already detailed are excluded from its provisions. Then no injustice would be done.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I have no objection to the first proposal of the Senator from Colorado that the provision under discussion shall only apply to officers on duty in connection with the organized militia of the several States and Territories.

For the general information, I will say that at the time I received the last report, which was a week or more ago, there were thirty officers on this character of detailed duty. Of this number there was one lieutenant-general, nine brigadier-generals, five colonels, three lieutenant-colonels, seven majors, and five captains. One-third of the number were general officers. There are, I know, quite a number of applications pending. The ten general officers were detailed in the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Kansas, Massachusetts, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Six of the ten States to which general officers were detailed have very small militia commands.

There is a good deal of force in what the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has said about the detail of a general officer to such a State as Pennsylvania and States that have sufficient militia to make a proper command for a general officer, but to States that have only a single regiment, or less, it seems a little out of place to detail an officer of such high rank. Heretofore officers detailed to such places have generally been officers even below the rank of major.

Mr. SPOONER. It is entirely in the hands of the Secretary of War, is it not?

Mr. PROCTOR. As a rule general officers have not applied for and have not been willing to take these places. The fact that a detail carries increased pay is one argument that has been used in favor of the proposition; it has been a seeking for the pecuniary reward. But general officers have not sought these places; they have not been willing to take them, and, in some cases, I know they have refused them.

Under the present arrangement a retired officer detailed to such duty not only gets the full active pay of his rank, but he gets commutation of quarters, amounting, in the case of a lieutenant-general, to \$1,200 a year, or \$100 a month; in the case of brigadier-generals and colonels of \$720 a year, and in the case of lieutenant-colonels and majors to \$600 a year, or about \$50 a month.

Mr. PATTERSON. I need not say to the Senator from Vermont that, although the militia of Colorado is not very large, it is very active, and has been very active. [Laughter.]

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the case of my own State, there are more than 6,000 men in the organized militia, which makes a reasonable command.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] has just stated that hitherto general officers have not been willing to assume these duties. When the bill containing the provision in regard to these details was passed last year, I understood its object was to encourage officers to assume these duties. Now, after officers have taken these details under the law, it is proposed by the provision under discussion, which is made retroactive, to turn around and deprive them of their increased pay. It seems to me an extremely unjust measure. I can not see, as the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] said he could not, why an officer performing active duty, although on the retired list, should not receive active-duty pay.

Any question of principle in it is lost by the fact that the provision is limited to apply only to officers above the grade of major. Officers of the grade of major and below are to receive full active pay when on active duty, but officers of higher rank are discriminated against.

At the proper time, Mr. President, as I said, I shall move to strike out the clause.

Mr. BAILEY. If the state of the law on this subject were what it ought to be, the Senate would have been spared this waste of time. The great pity is that there is any opportunity for Senators to discuss whether a man who is on the retired list should receive three-fourths or should receive his full pay. The rule ought to be now as the rule was during the first seventy-five years of the existence of this Republic, and there should be no retired list. Officers of the Army, like other American citizens, ought to be left to work, receiving their full pay while they are working, and then left to spend it or to save it, as their own prudence and economy might dictate.

There is no place in a system of government like ours for any class of men who receive compensation while rendering no service, and if to this primary truth it shall be answered that the Government did not pay these officers the full value of their services when they were on active duty, then I reply that the

Government ought not to treat its soldiers as it would its children, refusing to pay them the value of their services in order that it might save it for them in their old age. There are others performing as essential service as the soldiers who wear the uniform of this Republic, but who makes provision for them in their old age? A Senator may sit here for thirty-six years, as Senators have, but when by some unexpected revolution in the politics of his own State he is driven from this Chamber, old and worn with the public service, having made no provision for his age, he looks into the open door of the poorhouse. Why should the Senator and the Members of the House and other faithful officials of the Government be compelled to provide out of their own salary for the wants and necessities of their old age, while another class can spend with a free hand, conscious of the fact that the Government takes care of them when through their own imprudence they have failed to make provision for the care of themselves?

If it be true that the Government pays these officers a salary less than is equal to their service, then, sir, the salary ought to be immediately increased, and among soldiers just as among citizens, in their old age the prudent ones should enjoy the fruits of their prudence, and the improvident ones should be left to suffer the consequences of their improvidence. As for my part, I intend to vote to keep this provision in the bill because it at least is in the direction of withholding from some of these officers salary to which, in my judgment, they are not entitled.

I wonder how the Senate would receive a proposition that their salaries, instead of being \$5,000 a year, should hereafter be \$3,000 and that the Government should cover \$2,000 of their present salary into the Treasury to be paid back to them after they had been retired by their over-exacting constituents. Not one Senator in this Chamber would so far forget his sense of independence as to support such a measure.

Yet it is supposed that a Senator who protests against the retired list of the Army is actuated by some motive unfriendly to that organization. As far as I am concerned, I confess that I am not enamored of a standing army. I have long believed, and the longer I live the more firmly I believe it, that an army is at war with the real spirit of republican institutions. The discipline necessary to make an army a good one is utterly subversive of all our conceptions of republican freedom and equality. Still I recognize that it is one of these anomalous situations in which you can not apply the principle, and if put to the test I would not myself abolish the Army; I would not dismantle the great academies at which this Republic trains its soldiers and its sailors. I would maintain a small Army as a nucleus, and I would still draw from the body of the people the ambitious and adventurous youth who sought to qualify themselves for the service of their country when war might assail it; but I would treat the servants in the Army precisely as I would treat the public servants in the Senate and precisely as I would treat the public servants in every other department of the public service.

I would give them a fair compensation while they were working for the people and when their labors ended their salaries would cease. Had that I will not say sensible arrangement prevailed—because it would be somewhat offensive to say an arrangement would be sensible which is opposed by so many Senators here and probably advocated by myself alone, and for that reason I will not describe it as sensible, but I will venture to say that if this arrangement, which appears to me so sensible, existed now, we would have no question as to whether there was an attempt here to reach one man or another.

I want to say that I should have small patience with a Senator who would vent his spleen upon an officer of the United States Army, either personal or political, and my respect for the Senate and for Senators forbids me to think that this provision is intended only to reach the case of General Miles. Yet, as has been well said by the junior Senator from Colorado, the impression is so general that such is the case that if we are going to recognize the justice of paying something for nothing possibly it would be well for the Senate to secure itself against this misconstruction of its vote.

But as for my part, believing that no man is entitled to retired pay, I shall vote against giving it to any man. Even if I believed that it was inspired by the narrow and petty malice which many of the public prints attribute to those behind the proposition, I should still vote to do right, although I felt that the motive of those proposing it might be a wrong one.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I can assure the Senator from Texas that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs had no man in mind when they agreed to the words that are in the bill inserted by the House. I believe the committee, as a committee or as individuals, have been advised by the War Department

that hundreds of applications are being made and have been made for details to schools and for the militia and for other purposes in the different States, and I believe the House put that provision in the bill believing if it was concurred in by the Senate and became a law the pressure upon the War Department for these details would be less.

I am satisfied there is not a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate who had any particular man in view either for reward or for punishment, in concurring in the proviso put on the bill by the House.

I believe, Mr. President, that this is a wise provision. Senators all know that we have many schools in the different States, and those positions are largely sought for, and the pressure is very great upon the War Department to have officers detailed for these particular places, at least apparently for no other reason than that they may receive full pay. The Military Affairs Committee of the Senate thought that this provision put into the pending bill by the House was a wise one, and that it would work no injustice to any officer.

I simply rise, in defense of the committee, to say I am sure, as I stated before, that not a member of the committee had in view any particular officer whom this provision might reward or might punish.

Mr. PATTERSON. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia whether, if the proviso should be so altered as not to affect those who have been already detailed, but operating upon all future details, it would not relieve the evil of which the Department claims? Would it not relieve the pressure just as effectually as though it should remain in the words in which it is now framed?

Mr. SCOTT. I should answer in the affirmative.

Mr. MONEY. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia, who seems to be familiar with this bill and who is a member of the committee, one question. He speaks of the large number of requests made by officers to serve in the schools of the country. I wish to ask him if such assignments are not generally made from the active and not from the retired list?

Mr. SCOTT. In answer to that, Mr. President, I will say in the past it has been, but I understand now that it is the policy of the War Department, as far as possible, to assign those who are on the retired list.

The Senator from Mississippi will remember that by legislation in the past year we have retired, I think I am within bounds in saying, 250 officers by an increased grade and placing them on the retired list, and there is a greater number of officers now on the retired list, I am told, than ever before.

Mr. MONEY. It is simply, then, a change of practice or policy on the part of the Department. The practice heretofore has been to assign officers from the active list for this duty. Is that it?

Then I wish to ask one more question with respect to this clause which has been discussed. I will read it:

That hereafter no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty, receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer, so as to make his total pay and allowances exceed the pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

General Miles's name has been mentioned. Suppose he should accept one of these assignments to duty. I understand that then his pay as a retired Lieutenant-General of the Army and whatever pay might be awarded by the State of Massachusetts, if it exceeded that of the pay of a major on the retired list, would have to be cut down.

Mr. SCOTT. Not at all.

Mr. MONEY. That is the language of this bill.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from Mississippi probably was not in the Chamber when this was thoroughly discussed, and when I believe it was explained to the satisfaction of others. That is not the intent of this proviso. The intent is simply that he shall not receive pay additional to his retired pay if he is below the rank of a major or a lieutenant-colonel which would be equivalent to his pay as a retired officer. But it would not affect the retired pay of a colonel or brigadier-general or major-general.

Mr. MONEY. According to the explanation of the Senator from West Virginia, this clause does not mean what the committee intends. I do not think there is a court in the world that would interpret that provision as he has, for the language is so express and plain that it is impossible, it seems to me, to misunderstand it.

I wish to say that I am not in disagreement, but I do want to understand what we are doing. The proviso says as plainly as can be:

That hereafter no retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty, receive from the United States any

pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer so as to make his pay and allowances exceed the pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

If that has any meaning whatever, according to the ordinary construction of the English language, it means that while General Miles—his case has been brought up here by way of illustration—now has pay as a retired officer which exceeds the pay of a major on the active list, and in addition whatever pay may be offered by the State of Massachusetts for inspector-general, or whatever his office there is, it would have to be cut down if he accepted the office.

Mr. SCOTT. Not at all.

Mr. LODGE. If the Senator will allow me, do I understand him to say that General Miles is receiving pay from the State of Massachusetts?

Mr. MONEY. No; I did not.

Mr. LODGE. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. MONEY. I said any additional pay that might be offered by the State.

Mr. LODGE. He is not, as I understand it, receiving any pay from the State.

Mr. MONEY. I understand that. I stated a supposititious case, and only used General Miles's name inasmuch as it has been brought in here. We all know that he has been offered a place by Governor Douglas, and it is his particular case, everybody seems to assume. It is in the atmosphere somehow. I do not know how it got there. The papers all think so. I am taking that case. I will take the case of a man below him, the senior major-general on the retired list, or any major-general. His retired pay would be greater if he sat still at home and did nothing than would be his pay if he accepted a position on the staff of the governor of any of the States. In other words, he would receive less pay for doing something than he would for sitting still and doing nothing.

I suppose the committee have the same understanding as the Senator from West Virginia, but I can not possibly understand the proviso to mean that. I think to avoid future trouble it would be well enough to change this phraseology a little, as I am quite sure a court would construe it just as I have, because it can not mean anything else.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator from Mississippi permit me?

Mr. MONEY. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. The understanding of the committee, I will say to the Senator from Mississippi, with respect to the paragraph put in by the House, is that it is not intended to reduce the pay of any retired officer.

I believe if the Senator had been in the Senate Chamber when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. CARMACK] explained this proposition it would be satisfactory. He perhaps explained it better than I can. I will ask the Senator from Tennessee to state, for the benefit of the Senator from Mississippi, his construction of the wording of that clause in the bill. I think his explanation was perhaps better than anything I could say.

Mr. CARMACK. My construction of it, if the Senator from Mississippi will permit me, is this: This proviso operates on the total pay only by operating upon the additional pay or allowance. If a retired officer is receiving pay equal to or that exceeds that of a major on the active list, he can get no additional pay or allowance at all. If he is getting more than that it does not affect him. He gets no additional pay or allowance, but it does not operate to reduce his pay. The language is:

No retired officer of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty, receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer.

He is forbidden to receive only additional pay or allowances. It does not operate upon his pay as a retired officer at all. It does not affect his total pay and allowances unless the additional pay and allowances operate to make it exceed the pay and allowance of a major on the active list.

Take the case of General Miles, for instance. His name has been used here. His pay as a retired officer is greater than that of a major on the active list. But that is not by reason of any pay or allowances additional to his pay.

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator permit me to ask a question exactly at this point?

Mr. CARMACK. Yes, sir.

Mr. MONEY. The Senator says the pay of General Miles, for instance, or of a person of his rank, is greater now than that of a major on the active list. Now, suppose he accepts and is assigned to duty on the staff of the governor of a State and has a salary—they are generally small—allowed him. Then is he to be cut down in his pay to that of a major on the active list, or is he not?

Mr. CARMACK. Not at all.

Mr. MONEY. But this says he must be.

Mr. CARMACK. No, sir. This operates only upon his additional pay and allowances. He is forbidden to receive nothing except additional pay or allowances.

Mr. MONEY. The Senator will permit me. Here is what it says. He shall not—

when assigned to active duty, receive from the United States any pay or allowances additional to his pay as a retired officer so as to make his total pay and allowances—

“Total pay and allowances.”

Mr. CARMACK. “So as to make.”

Mr. MONEY (reading):

exceed the pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

Mr. CARMACK. That is, if the additional pay and allowances make it exceed—

Mr. MONEY. Very well. Then he is not to receive any more if it exceeds that?

Mr. CARMACK. If the additional pay and allowances make his pay as a retired officer exceed that of a major on the active list—

Mr. SPOONER. That is not what it says.

Mr. MONEY. It says the “total pay or allowances.” “Pay” for what? Pay for the retired list. “Allowances” for what? For the assignment. Now, when they unite, as they certainly must do in the case of an officer of the grade of major-general, so as to exceed the pay of a major on the active list, then, according to this proposed law, the pay must be cut down so as not to exceed the pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

Mr. CARMACK. No.

Mr. MONEY. I may be wrong, gentlemen, but I can not consider it in any other way.

Mr. CARMACK. The proviso does not say that his total pay and allowances shall not exceed the pay of a major on the active list.

Mr. MONEY. That is exactly what it does say.

Mr. CARMACK. It does not say so. It only says that he shall not receive additional pay or allowances where it makes his pay exceed that of a major on the active list. He is forbidden to receive nothing except additional pay or allowances, and in case where the pay of a retired officer is already equal to or exceeds that of a major on the active list, we simply provide that he shall get no additional pay or allowances.

Mr. SCOTT. He gets his entire pay.

Mr. MONEY. Then I understand the committee to believe that it provides that an officer whose retired pay is above that of a major on the active list shall still receive that pay, but shall receive nothing from the State to which he is assigned.

Mr. SCOTT. That is it.

Mr. MONEY. Is that the understanding?

Mr. SCOTT. That is it exactly.

Mr. MONEY. How many do you suppose will accept service under such conditions?

Mr. SCOTT. We do not care.

Mr. MONEY. Of course you do not.

Mr. CARMACK. It might be amended—

Mr. PROCTOR. If the Senator from Tennessee will excuse me, I was just about to make a suggestion. I offer the following, in lieu of this proviso:

Provided, That hereafter retired officers of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty in connection with the organized militia in the several States or Territories upon the request of the governor thereof, receive their full retired pay and also commutation of quarters unless Government quarters are available, and shall receive no further pay or allowances: Provided further, That a lieutenant-colonel so assigned shall receive the full pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

Mr. CARMACK. I think that is better.

Mr. MONEY. I think that expresses it very clearly. I have no objection to the intention of the committee, but I did object to the language of its phraseology, and I think the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee improves it very much.

Mr. PROCTOR. That leaves out all officers who are assigned to other duties than in connection with the organization of the militia.

Mr. SCOTT. Let us have the amendment read from the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The Senator from Vermont, on behalf of the committee, offers an amendment, which will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The SECRETARY. On page 13 of the bill, in the paragraph beginning in line 4, strike out the proviso and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, That hereafter retired officers of the Army above the grade of major shall, when assigned to active duty in connection with the organized militia in the several States or Territories upon the request

of the governor thereof, receive their full retired pay and also commutation of quarters unless Government quarters are available, and shall receive no further pay or allowances: Provided further, That a lieutenant-colonel so assigned shall receive the full pay and allowances of a major on the active list.

Mr. PROCTOR. This gives them commutation of quarters. In the case of General Miles it amounts to \$1,200; in that of a brigadier-general, \$720; and in the case of the lower officers, about \$600 in addition to their retired pay.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, while the proposed amendment may remove the obscurity, it does not the injustice. It still prohibits an officer assigned to active service in the militia from receiving anything in addition. I confess—

Mr. CARMACK. From the United States Government.

Mr. FULTON. From the United States Government.

Mr. SCOTT. But not from the State.

Mr. FULTON. Certainly not from the State. But he is performing services for the United States Government, nevertheless. There is no more important duty, in my judgment, than that an officer of the Army can perform than that which he performs in training and organizing the militia of the several States.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] says that General Miles in serving his State does not receive pay. I do not know whether or not any of the other States make provision for payment in such cases. But be that as it may, when this Government assigns an officer who is on the retired list to active duty, whether in the service of the State militia or elsewhere, I submit he is entitled to have active pay. If he is competent to perform the duties, there is no reason why he should not have the pay of his rank.

Now, if this amendment should be adopted, the effect it would have in the State which I represent in part would be to deprive us, I have no doubt, of the services of a very able retired army officer, who has been detailed to the militia service in that State, and who has done more to build up the militia of that State and make it efficient than has the service of any other one man connected with it.

Mr. SCOTT. What is his rank?

Mr. FULTON. Colonel. I refer to Colonel Jackson, retired. It would be a great loss to the militia organization in that State to be deprived of his services.

It may be said: “Very well, the State can make up the difference.” But it has always been my conviction, and it is now, that this Government should have charge, as far as possible, of the organization of the militia, and when it assigns an officer to take charge of it or to organize it, to train it, this Government should pay at least the salary of that officer.

I trust that this amendment will not be adopted. I hope to see this entire proviso stricken from the bill. I can not see that there is any demand for it. I do not know what the purpose was of those who originally framed it. If it should happen to be true, as contended, that army officers on the retired list are seeking employment of this character, I can not see that it constitutes a ground for just criticism of them. There is no reason why they should not seek the employment. They are physically able to discharge the duties. They are certainly the very ones who should discharge the duty because of their fitness for it.

I think the law as it stands at the present time is exactly the law we want. It is doing more to make the militia of the several States efficient, to bring it up to the standard that should be required than any law we have ever had. It is a very small amount that the law as it stands to-day will take from the Treasury, and the loss that would result to the militia organizations would, in my judgment, be far in excess of the expense that we would be put to in maintaining the law as it is.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Vermont only accentuates the injustice. The amendment he offers concedes in part the proposition which the Senator from Wisconsin laid down, and which I do not believe can be successfully combated, that it gives to an officer detailed to a court of inquiry, we will say, full active pay, but if he is engaged in the active work of the militia, then he is to be cut down. It concedes active pay for one kind of active work and denies it for another. It is more unjust and more discriminating than the present somewhat blind clause that came from the House.

Moreover, Mr. President, I think by that amendment—of course it is very hard to judge an amendment so elaborate as this is simply by hearing it read—such an officer would be debarred from taking any pay from a State.

Mr. CARMACK. Under this amendment?

Mr. LODGE. I think so. I may be mistaken. It is very hard to judge from hearing the amendment read.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Senator is mistaken, I think.

Mr. LODGE. I am speaking of the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont which has just been read at the desk.

I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Vermont ought to go over and be printed and give us an opportunity to see it to-morrow. I am against the whole proposition. I do not think it ought to be retroactive. I think it ought to go out altogether. I am entirely one with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. FULTON]. But if that can not be done, we at least ought to get the retroactive feature out of it. We ought to make sure that the amendment as now proposed does not deprive the officer of the right to accept pay from the State if that is offered.

I repeat, this amendment shows more clearly than anything that has yet been offered what the precise purpose of this legislation is. It is now explicitly narrowed down to those officers who have taken service and who have been detailed to duty with the militia, and an officer who may be given some of the other duties enumerated in the law, none of them as severe, none of them as active, is allowed, if the amendment of the Senator from Vermont shall prevail, to get the full active pay.

But I hope the Senator will allow the amendment to go over and be printed, so that we may have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it clearly appears to me from the opposition made to this amendment that it is the purpose to allow the fortunate officers who happen to get this detail first to get the full pay of an officer on the active list and then to get two or three thousand dollars in addition from the State to which they are detailed. Now, why should an officer who happens to be detailed by the War Department to take charge of the militia of a given State be placed in a position which gives him an opportunity to receive more pay than a man of his grade on the active list of the United States Army?

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me at that point?

Mr. NELSON. That is the gravamen of the Senator's objection to this amendment. He not only wants them to receive the full pay that an officer on the active list receives, but he wants them to be given the opportunity to get two or three thousand dollars more from the States.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly. Why should an officer who is detailed on this duty be put in a position to get more pay than an officer on the active list of the United States Army? Will the Senator from Massachusetts explain that proposition?

Mr. LODGE. I was going to say to the Senator that, without intending it, he was completely misstating my proposition. I do not want the officer to get double pay from the State and from the United States, but this amendment not only cuts off his pay from the United States, but it cuts it off from the State, too, I think.

Mr. NELSON. No, sir.

Mr. LODGE. I am perfectly willing to have it cut off from the State. If he is to receive his full active pay I am perfectly willing that that should be done, but if he is to be debarred from getting full active pay I do not see why the State should be debarred from paying him.

Mr. NELSON. The State is not debarred by this amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Perhaps it is not, but I think it appears so on the amendment.

Mr. NELSON. It simply says that when a retired officer is detailed for this duty by the War Department and put on active duty as a militia officer he shall get simply the pay of a retired officer. There is nothing in it prohibiting the State from paying him one, two, or three thousand dollars.

Mr. LODGE. I hope there is not, but it seemed to me that there was.

Mr. NELSON. If a major-general of the United States Army is detailed, with the permission of the War Department, as adjutant-general of his State—in my State, if he should get this detail, he would be entitled to a salary of twenty-five hundred dollars a year. Now, what the Senator insists upon, if I have understood his argument, and I have listened to it, is that a man detailed to such duty shall not only get the full pay of an officer on the active list of the Army, but also get the twenty-five hundred if detailed to my State or any State.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. NELSON. I believe under the circumstances this restriction is just and proper. They seek these duties. They apply to the governors of their respective States and get them to beg the War Department to detail them, and why? They want that privilege in order, first, they can draw the full pay of an officer on the active list, and then, in addition to that, get whatever the States allow them. Now, I submit that is not fair. It is not just.

Mr. LODGE. Let me say one word. I have already said, and I want to say again, that in the case of my State General

Miles is not drawing pay from the State. I believe he has refused explicitly to do so.

Mr. SCOTT. I would suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that we are not discussing General Miles, but we are discussing a general provision of the bill.

Mr. LODGE. You are discussing General Miles, because he is one of the officers whom you are going to cut down.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, in regard to the objection of the Senator from Massachusetts that officers detailed to courts-martial and the like should be put on the same footing as these, I think that was answered by a remark the Senator from Wisconsin made. That duty is temporary and they are subjected to extra expenses. They have to stop at hotels. There is a very good reason why a long detail should bear some restriction that should not be applied in the other cases that are provided for in the act of last year.

They are saved, too, from a very large expense that officers of the Regular Army on active duty have to bear, and that is in moving. Every move subjects an officer on the active list to quite an expense. In some cases I know that it has practically used up all their salary, where the moves have been frequent, as they sometimes are.

I think, balancing all the advantages, these officers, with their commutation of quarters, their steady service, the help that they are sure to receive from the State, subjected to but little expense, and I believe generally they are entertained when they travel, their balance sheet at the end of the year will be quite as good as that of officers on the active list.

In regard to what the Senator from Oregon [Mr. FULTON] said about the pay of a colonel, I think I stated that he would receive under this proposal a little over \$4,000 a year.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont has made very plain to the Senate the laborious nature of the labors of officers connected with courts-martial and courts of inquiry, and that those labors are so excessive and so expensive that the officers ought to have full active pay. But he omitted to say anything about staff duty, not involving service with troops. Retired officers are assigned to staff duties not involving services with troops and they are entitled to full active pay. But an officer who is assigned to militia duty, who is obliged to travel about the State, who is obliged to hold inspections and reviews constantly throughout the year and attend the camps and maneuvers in summer, is not supposed to be on such active duty. I adhere to my proposition that this is accentuating the injustice.

Now, Mr. President, I hope the Senator will allow the amendment to go over and be printed.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator let me ask him a question in regard to the assignment of General Miles to Massachusetts? Under the law, if he is a retired officer and the governor of Massachusetts asks that he be detailed to that State to organize the militia, it is optional with him as to whether he will accept or not. Is not that true?

Mr. LODGE. Entirely.

Mr. CLAY. I understand that under the law after he is retired he may be assigned to any duty in the United States, but he could not be assigned to any State except by his consent after he is a retired officer.

Mr. PROCTOR. I do not know how that is. Of course he would have to go if the President assigned him.

Mr. CLAY. To a State?

Mr. LODGE. Undoubtedly, if the President assigned him.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think that is a mistake. He can only be assigned to certain duties specified in the statute.

Mr. LODGE. That is one of the duties specified by the statute.

Mr. CLAY. I will say to the Senator, then, if it be true that the President has a right to assign him to a State—

Mr. LODGE. Beyond a doubt.

Mr. CLAY. For the purpose of organizing the militia while engaged in active service, why should he not have the full pay of an active officer?

Mr. LODGE. The language is that the Secretary of War may assign retired officers, with their consent.

Mr. CLAY. Could it be done, then, without their consent?

Mr. LODGE. Their consent must be had for all these duties.

Mr. CLAY. It is optional with the officers?

Mr. LODGE. It is optional with them to take any of these duties, as I have just said.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. PROCTOR. There is a very light Senate here.

Mr. TELLER. We can hardly take any vote this afternoon.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think I will consent to that request, and ask that a vote may be taken on it when the bill is first taken up to-morrow, if the Senator from Massachusetts will accept that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will be the pending question in the morning.

Mr. LODGE. I think it would be better to set some suitable time, because to say "when the bill is first taken up" is rather vague.

Mr. PROCTOR. Very well.

Mr. CARMACK. Is it proposed to cut off further debate on it?

Mr. PROCTOR. I will say at half past 1. Is that satisfactory?

Mr. SCOTT. We do not meet until 1 to-morrow.

Mr. PROCTOR. I beg pardon; I will say 2 o'clock.

Mr. BERRY. I ask if the Senate is to vote on the motion to strike out? Is that the proposition?

Mr. LODGE. Of course, the motion to strike out and insert comes first.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I do not think anything ought to be agreed to that will prevent the examination of this proposed amendment. The language used does not say "paid by the United States," and probably it would preclude the officer from receiving any pay from the State. That, I think, ought not to be.

There is another question I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont. Some retired officers are, I know, assigned to the industrial universities in different States in connection with drilling the students. Would that be considered militia duty?

Mr. LODGE and Mr. PROCTOR. No.

Mr. BERRY. Then they would get full pay under the present law and under the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROCTOR. It does not affect them at all.

Mr. LODGE. It does not affect them.

Mr. BERRY. Under the amendment, although they are retired officers, they are not affected. If they are retired officers, the provision as it came from the House would affect them.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator's criticism shows the need of printing the amendment, so that we may examine it with care.

Mr. BERRY. That is exactly what I was going to suggest.

Mr. PROCTOR. The amendment leaves out everything except officers detailed for service in the militia.

Mr. BERRY. I think if the militia officer is cut down those doing duty at the different universities should receive only the retired pay. In fact, I think the House provision is right. These officers have been retired by law. The Government of the United States says, "After you are 64 years old we will pay you only three-fourths of your regular pay."

I do not think that under any circumstances they, by accepting service with the State militia, should be permitted to get full pay or that there should be this activity in trying to get service in the different States in order that they might get full pay.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator from Arkansas allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MONEY. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to either Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. MONEY. I simply want to remind the Senator from Arkansas that the detail to universities does not involve whatever any pay from any State. Therefore they should have their full pay. They are generally appointed from active service, and there is no State I know of that is paying them anything.

Mr. BERRY. I so understood, Mr. President, but I have known cases where they were assigned from the retired list, and in that case, as I understand the House provision, they would be put on an equal footing with all other retired officers who accept service from the State for any purpose. Now, I will yield to the Senator from Wisconsin. He wanted to ask me a question.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator thinks this proposition is right?

Mr. BERRY. I think the proposition as it came from the House is right.

Mr. SPOONER. That is what I understand the Senator to mean.

Mr. BERRY. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator think that a retired officer who is assigned to duty on the staff of the Army in war or in peace, doing a man's full duty, should receive only three-fourths pay?

Mr. BERRY. I understand it says "with his consent." Where he is assigned in the Regular Army by the President of the United States to fight in battle, that is a different proposition; but this is a case where he goes only with his own consent, as I understand it, and it is proposed to cut down his pay.

I think where he was actually assigned in time of war it would be a different proposition. But as to the officers who have been retired and, as I think the Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] said, who have been well provided for, I do not think there can be any complaint coming from that source. If they strive to get these positions, I am perfectly willing for them to get all they can from the State in addition, but I am opposed to the United States paying them full pay to perform duty in the States, which they do by their own consent and are not compelled to do.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, only one word in reply to what has been said by the Senator from Arkansas. It may have been improvident legislation, but we passed legislation offering these retired officers this duty and this pay, and the moment any of them availed themselves of it then it is proposed to turn around on those who have availed themselves of it and cut them off. They did not seek the legislation. The legislation was put in presumably for the benefit of the militia. We made a deliberate offer to them. They accepted the offer. The moment we find them getting pretty handsome pay we step forward and cut them off. Now, because we were improvident in our legislation it does not seem to me that it is quite fair to punish the men who availed themselves of that legislation certainly in good faith.

Mr. PROCTOR. I ask unanimous consent that this amendment may go over and be voted on at 2 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. CARMACK. Is the vote to be taken without further debate on the amendment?

Mr. PROCTOR. No; I do not say that. We are to debate it until that time.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator will call it up before 2 o'clock, so as to give an opportunity to debate it.

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly; it may be taken up the very first thing.

Mr. LODGE. Let me suggest to the Senator that the Senate will not meet until 1 o'clock to-morrow. There will be the usual morning business transacted. If Senators desire to debate the amendment a little further, it would be well to put the time a little later.

Mr. BERRY. Not later than 3, I suggest to the Senator.

Mr. LODGE. Not later than 3.

Mr. PROCTOR. I will say not later than 3 o'clock, so that there may be some explanation of it made.

Mr. TELLER. I ask leave to offer an amendment in order that it may be printed. I only want to have it printed. I may call it up to-morrow. On page 13, after the word "dollars," in the fifteenth line, I ask that the following may be inserted. I do not care about having it read. Just let it be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

The Senator from Vermont asks unanimous consent that a vote on this amendment may be taken to-morrow at an hour not later than 3 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. NELSON. I wish the Senator would amend his request so that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside for that purpose. Let him join that with his request.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That will be done at any rate when the hour of 2 o'clock arrives.

Mr. NELSON. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

The reading of the bill was resumed at page 13, line 18. The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous," on page 14, line 17, after the word "inquiry," to insert "military commissions;" so as to make the clause read:

For expenses of courts-martial, courts of inquiry, military commissions, and compensation of reporters and witnesses attending the same, \$20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 2, to increase the appropriation for travel allowance to enlisted men on discharge, from \$1,250,000 to \$1,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to page 15, line 7, the last paragraph read being as follows:

For interest on soldiers' deposits, \$125,000, and so much as may be necessary to pay back such deposits.

Mr. CARMACK. I wish to know something about that provision in the bill relative to "interest on soldiers' deposits." I am not familiar with it.

Mr. PROCTOR. There is a small interest allowed. I can not inform the Senator just what it is, but to-morrow morning I will try to answer his question.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill to page 16, line 12, the last paragraphs read being as follows:

For Porto Rico Provisional Regiment of Infantry, composed of two battalions of four companies each.

Pay of officers of the line, \$44,400.

For additional pay for length of service, \$6,500.

Pay of enlisted men, \$95,148.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Vermont to lines 5 to 10 on page 16. I observe that the Secretary of War recommended twice that the regiment in Porto Rico should be disbanded. I have before me the report of the Secretary of War for 1901 and 1902. He uses in that report the following language:

I recommend that the discontinuance of that regiment be now directed, and that at the same time the right of enlistment in the Regular Army be extended to citizens of Porto Rico. There is no longer occasion for maintaining a special and peculiar force in the island, at the expense of the United States, outside of the coast-defense fortifications. Under the prosperous conditions which have followed the very liberal treatment of the island by the United States, the insular government is well able to support a police force adequate to preserve internal peace and order, and there is no more reason for maintaining a special United States force in addition to the Regular Army to protect Porto Rico against external attack than there is to maintain such a force to protect any part of our territory on the Atlantic coast. The people of Porto Rico should, however, have an opportunity to share in the general defense of the Government to which they owe allegiance and of the institutions which they enjoy.

I see that the Secretary of War has recommended twice that that regiment be disbanded and he said that it was of no use whatever.

Mr. PROCTOR. I will say in answer to the Senator from Georgia that that Secretary of War, Secretary Root, changed his mind; that he came before the Committee on Military Affairs and said he had concluded it advisable to retain that organization, with a good many changes; and that he assisted the committee in preparing those changes which were adopted in the army bill of two years ago, I believe.

Mr. CARMACK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is this Porto Rican regiment a part of the Regular Army?

Mr. PROCTOR. No; it is not. It is a provisional force to continue for four years, running, I think, two years and a half longer.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is composed of natives.

Mr. CARMACK. What objection would there be to organizing a Porto Rican regiment as a part of the Regular Army?

Mr. PROCTOR. There would not be any on my part. That is the theory I have favored and I have tried to work toward it. I was ready and would have been glad to have seen a full regiment organized to take the place of one of the present regiments. That was discussed by Secretary Root in the committee, and the present arrangement looks toward some final incorporation of it in the Regular Army, not, so far as I have heard the matter discussed, to increase the Regular Army at all, but to take the place of one of the present regiments.

Mr. CLAY. I ask the Senator from Vermont, Is it not true that the Secretary of War recommended that the Porto Ricans should be allowed to enlist in the Regular Army and become a part of the Regular Army, and that he recommended, I believe twice, that this regiment be disbanded as being of no service, that it was not needed? I believe that under the law as it stands now a Porto Rican can not enlist in the Regular Army, and it would be necessary to change the law to disband this regiment and allow them to enlist. That was the recommendation, I noticed, of the Secretary of War.

Mr. CARMACK. I wanted to know whether really we could organize a regiment of the Regular Army made up of Porto Ricans according to law.

Mr. PROCTOR. I suppose their status as citizens would have to be settled first.

Mr. TELLER. What is that status?

Mr. CARMACK. That is what I wanted to inquire.

Mr. TELLER. Can the Senator from Vermont say what their relation is to the United States?

Mr. SPOONER rose.

Mr. TELLER. Perhaps the Senator from Wisconsin can state, as he is getting up.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is too large a question to discuss in the time before 4 o'clock.

Mr. SPOONER. Just started from one shore and not yet landed on the other.

Mr. CARMACK. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Vermont that unless the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY] does so I shall move an amendment to this provision, striking out everything, beginning in line 5, down to and including line 10, and substituting something else for it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be open to amendment as in Committee of the Whole after the committee amendments shall have been disposed of, and again open to amendment in the Senate.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Philippine Scouts," on page 16, line 19, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifteen thousand" and insert "thirty-four thousand seven hundred and twenty;" so as to make the clause read:

Additional for length of service, \$34,720.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 6, after the word "audit," to insert:

And the Secretary of War may hereafter authorize the assignment to duty in the office of the Paymaster-General of all such paymasters' clerks now authorized by law as may be necessary for that purpose."

So as to make the clause read:

All the money hereinbefore appropriated for pay of the Army and miscellaneous shall be disbursed and accounted for by officers of the Pay Department as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund: *Provided*, That hereafter all the accounts of individual paymasters shall be analyzed under the several heads of the appropriation and recorded in detail by the Paymaster-General of the Army before said accounts are forwarded to the Treasury Department for final audit, and the Secretary of War may hereafter authorize the assignment to duty in the office of the Paymaster-General of all such paymasters' clerks now authorized by law as may be necessary for that purpose.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Quartermaster's Department," on page 25, line 7, after the word "cavalry," to strike out "and artillery" and insert "artillery, and engineers;" and in line 9, after the word "artillery," to insert "and engineers;" so as to read:

Horses for cavalry, artillery, and engineers: For the purchase of horses for the cavalry, artillery, and engineers, and for the Indian scouts, and for such infantry and members of the Hospital Corps in field campaigns as may be required to be mounted, and the expenses incident thereto, \$200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 24, after the word "established," to strike out "without" and insert "except upon the recommendation of the Secretary of War and by;" so as to make the proviso read:

Provided further, That hereafter no military post within the United States shall be established except upon the recommendation of the Secretary of War and by the express authority of Congress.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the clause for "Transportation of the Army and its supplies," on page 28, line 20, after the word "oceans," to insert:

And hereafter no steamship in the transport service of the United States shall be sold or disposed of without the consent of Congress having been first had or obtained;

So as to read:

The expenses of sailing public transports on the various rivers, the Gulf of Mexico, and the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, and hereafter no steamship in the transport service of the United States shall be sold or disposed of without the consent of Congress having been first had or obtained, etc.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill to let that amendment go over until to-morrow.

Mr. PROCTOR. Yes; let it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will go over.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 30, line 10, after the word "dollars," to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That no part of the \$12,000,000 hereby appropriated shall be paid to any steamship company for the transportation of supplies or enlisted men or officers of the United States from the Philippine Islands to the United States or from the United States to the Philippine Islands.

Mr. PROCTOR. Let that amendment go over.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is right.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to the end of line 22 on page 31.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I think that is the point where the amendment which I presented earlier in to-day's session, to be acted on later, ought to come in.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator withhold his amendment until after the committee amendments have been disposed of?

Mr. BAILEY. I should like, if the Senator in charge of the bill will agree, to have the amendment inserted just at this place.

Mr. PROCTOR. I wish the Senator would let his amendment go over, because I should like to have the reading of the bill concluded before 4 o'clock.

Mr. BAILEY. Very well. I will not insist upon its consideration now.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, under the subhead "Engineer Department," on page 36, after line 7, to insert the following proviso:

Provided further, To cover extra expense in the establishment of the Engineer School and post at Washington Barracks, District of Columbia, due to difficult foundations, increased cost of labor, and other unforeseen and adverse contingencies, \$150,000, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Ordnance Department," on page 37, line 19, after the word "homes," to insert "including material for cartridges, bags, reworking obsolete powder, and similar items;" on page 38, line 2, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two," and insert "five;" and in the same line, before the word "thousand," to strike out "and fifty;" so as to make the clause read:

Ordnance, ordnance stores, and supplies: Manufacture or purchase of metallic ammunition and the materials therefor for small arms for current needs and reserve supply, and ammunition for reloading cartridges, including the cost of targets and material for target practice, ammunition for burials at the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its several Branches, including National Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., and at soldiers' and sailors' State homes, and for firing the morning and evening gun at military posts prescribed by General Orders, No. 70, Headquarters of the Army, dated July 23, 1867, and at National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its several Branches, including National Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., and at soldiers' and sailors' State homes, including material for cartridges, bags, reworking obsolete powder, and similar items, and marksmen's medals and insignia for all arms of the service, \$1,500,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 1, after the word "from," to strike out "railroad or other transportation companies" and insert "carriers;" in line 8, after the word "of," where it occurs the second time, to strike out "ordnance," and insert "or damage to military," and in line 9, after the word "the," to strike out—

fund "Replacing ordnance and ordnance stores" on the books of the Treasury Department—

And insert—

proper appropriation or funds out of which such or similar stores shall be replaced and individual pieces of United States armament which are not needed on account of historical value, and can be advantageously replaced, may be sold at a price not less than their cost price, when there exists for such sale sentimental reasons adequate in the judgment of the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy.

So as to make the clause read:

Hereafter moneys arising from deductions made from carriers on account of the loss of or damage to military stores in transit shall be credited to the proper appropriation or funds out of which such or similar stores shall be replaced and individual pieces of United States armament which are not needed on account of historical value, and can be advantageously replaced, may be sold at a price not less than their cost price, when there exist for such sale sentimental reasons adequate in the judgment of the Secretary of War or Secretary of the Navy.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 4 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement the consideration of pension bills is now in order.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, I should like to have the reading of the appropriation bill concluded. There is less than a page to be read, and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has consented that the reading may be finished.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no objection, the reading of the bill will be resumed and concluded.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Military Affairs was, on page 40, line 11, to change the date "1905" to "1906;" so as to make the clause read:

All funds received as the value of military stores transferred by the several staff departments of the Army to the Insular Department of the Philippines shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States and remain available during the fiscal year 1906 for the procurement of like military stores to replace those so transferred.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

CONSIDERATION OF PENSION BILLS.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, being the statehood bill, be laid aside for the rest of the day in order that the Senate may proceed to the consideration of pension bills under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made. The first pension bill on the Calendar will be stated.

EDMUND B. KANADA.

The bill (S. 6115) granting an increase of pension to Edmund B. Kanada was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "captain," to strike out "also" and insert "and;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Edmund B. Kanada, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and captain Company G, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOLOMON KNIGHT.

The bill (S. 139) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Knight was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "and," to strike out "Infantry" and insert "Cavalry;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Solomon Knight, late of Company F, First Regiment Nebraska Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL A. THOMAS.

The bill (S. 2538) granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. Thomas was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "and," to strike out "Heavy Artillery, Maine Volunteers," and insert "Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel A. Thomas, late of Company H, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID DEARDOURFF.

The bill (H. R. 13241) granting an increase of pension to David Deardourff was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David Deardourff, late of Company C, Fiftieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES HAMMONDS.

The bill (H. R. 5997) granting an increase of pension to James Hammonds was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James Hammonds, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNIE YOUNG.

The bill (H. R. 4627) granting a pension to Annie Young was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Annie Young, widow of Jacob Young, late of Company H, Thirty-eighth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE M. SIMMONS.

The bill (H. R. 6354) granting an increase of pension to George M. Simmons was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of George M. Simmons, late of Company D, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KEARNEY MAY.

The bill (H. R. 14919) granting a pension to Kearney May was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Kearney May, helpless and dependent son of Thomas May, late of Company H, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month, the same to be paid to his legally appointed and qualified guardian.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA HIGGINS.

The bill (H. R. 9939) granting an increase of pension to Martha Higgins was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Martha Higgins, widow of Thomas Higgins, late captain Company H, Fourteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Agnes M. Higgins, helpless and dependent child of said Thomas Higgins, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Martha Higgins the name of said Agnes M. Higgins shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Martha Higgins.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES M. PAUL.

The bill (H. R. 15190) granting an increase of pension to James M. Paul was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James M. Paul, late of Company K, One hundred and seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA A. DUNN.

The bill (H. R. 15686) granting an increase of pension to Anna A. Dunn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Anna A. Dunn, widow of Michael Dunn, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLA M. ROBERTS.

The bill (S. 4214) granting an increase of pension to Ella M. Roberts was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ella M. Roberts, widow of Cyrus M. Roberts, late first lieutenant, Company E, and captain, Company F, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM GEYSER.

The bill (S. 5323) granting an increase of pension to William Geysier was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and "insert "thirty," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Geysier, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA M. BENNY.

The bill (S. 6224) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Benny was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the words "widow of," to strike

out the initial "W." and insert the name "William;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Anna M. Benny, widow of William B. Benny, late of Company C, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENJAMIN F. CORY.

The bill (S. 2895) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Cory was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Benjamin F. Cory, late provost-marshal Eleventh Congressional district of Ohio, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALMON S. MATHEWS.

The bill (S. 6087) granting an increase of pension to Salmon S. Mathews was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "late," to strike out the name "Mathews" and insert "Mathews," and in the same line, after the word "captain," to insert "Company D;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Salmon S. Mathews, late captain Company D, and major Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Salmon S. Mathews."

SAMUEL A. McNEIL.

The bill (S. 5072) granting an increase of pension to S. A. McNeil was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," to strike out the initial "S" and insert the name "Samuel;" in the same line, after the word "late," to strike out "sergeant;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel A. McNeil, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Samuel A. McNeil."

EMORY A. WOOD.

The bill (S. 3467) granting an increase of pension to Emory A. Wood was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Emory A. Wood, late of Company F, Second Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Fourteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Emmory A. Wood."

HENRY BERKSTRESSER.

The bill (S. 4215) granting an increase of pension to Henry Berkstresser was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "first lieutenant;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry Berkstresser, late first lieutenant Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHITTLE CHITTLESON.

The bill (S. 6174) granting an increase of pension to Chittle Chittleson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Chittle Chittleson, late of Company G, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN R. McCULLOUGH.

The bill (S. 2731) granting an increase of pension to John R. McCullough was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John R. McCullough, late hospital steward, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW J. LARRABEE.

The bill (S. 2977) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Larrabee was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Andrew J. Larrabee, late musician, band, Third Brigade, Fourth Division, Fifteenth United States Army Corps, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CELLINA H. STEPHENS.

The bill (S. 5157) granting an increase of pension to Cellina H. Stephens was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Cellina H. Stephens, widow of Elias G. Stephens, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALEXANDER HAY.

The bill (S. 5669) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Hay was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alexander Hay, late of Company A, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM H. WHITE.

The bill (S. 5999) granting an increase of pension to William H. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. White, late of Company C, Eighty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUCRETIA JOHNSON.

The bill (S. 5391) granting an increase of pension to Lucretia Johnson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lucretia Johnson, widow of George P. Johnson, late of Company M, Second Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM W. WILLIS.

The bill (S. 5392) granting an increase of pension to William W. Willis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William W. Willis, late second lieutenant Company A, Seventh Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY OAKLEY.

The bill (S. 3660) granting an increase of pension to Mary Oakley was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Oakley, widow of Chauncey B. Oakley, late captain Company E, Eighty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and lieutenant-colonel One hundred and forty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M. C. SOWERS.

The bill (S. 5463) granting an increase of pension to John M. C. Sowers was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and Company G, Fifth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John M. C. Sowers, late of Company D, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, and Company G, Fifth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CYRUS N. BRADLEY.

The bill (S. 3392) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus N. Bradley was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the name "Bradley," to strike out "of Indianapolis, Iowa;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Cyrus N. Bradley, late of Company I, Fortieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M. BIGGER.

The bill (S. 3841) granting an increase of pension to John M. Bigger was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out

"of Company M" and insert "first lieutenant and regimental quartermaster;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John M. Bigger, late first lieutenant and regimental quartermaster First Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETER KAUFMAN.

The bill (S. 4128) granting an increase of pension to Peter Kaufman was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Peter Kaufman, late of Company F, Seventy-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM H. TREVILLIAN.

The bill (S. 459) granting an increase of pension to William H. Trevillian was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William H. Trevillian, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGIANNA EUBANKS.

The bill (S. 5651) granting a pension to Georgianna Eubanks was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, after the word "of," to strike out "twelve" and insert "eight;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Georgianna Eubanks, widow of Joseph W. Eubanks, late captain Company K, Second Regiment Arkansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL B. MANN.

The bill (S. 2240) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Mann was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel B. Mann, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL N. ROCKHOLD.

The bill (S. 1565) granting an increase of pension to S. N. Rockhold was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," to strike out the

letter "S." and insert the name "Samuel;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel N. Rockhold, late of Company F, One hundred and third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment to the title so as to make it read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Rockland."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the pending bill. It proposes to grant an increase of pension to S. N. Rockhold, and the title is proposed to be amended so as to read "Rockland." The Chair supposes it ought to be "Rockhold."

Mr. McCUMBER. I think so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The title will be amended as indicated.

BETSY J. NORTHRUP.

The bill (S. 4548) granting a pension to Betsy J. Northrup was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "wagon," to insert "late;" and in line 7, before the word "First," to strike out "in the;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Betsy J. Northrup, widow of Anson Northrup, late wagon master, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LA FAYETTE SMITH.

The bill (S. 5577) granting an increase of pension to La Fayette Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "sergeant" and insert "of;" and in the same line, after the word "Seventh," to insert "Independent;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of La Fayette Smith, late of Seventh Independent Battery Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBION L. MITCHELL.

The bill (S. 5539) granting an increase of pension to A. L. Mitchell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Albion L. Mitchell, late lieutenant-colonel Sixty-third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Albion L. Mitchell."

RILEY W. CAVINS.

The bill (S. 1562) granting an increase of pension to Riley W. Cavins was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of"

and insert "musician, band;" and in line 7, after the word "Infantry," to strike out "Band;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Riley W. Cavins, late musician, band, Fourteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW R. M'CURDY.

The bill (S. 2107) granting an increase of pension to A. R. McCurdy was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," to strike out the letter "A," and insert the name "Andrew;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Andrew R. McCurdy, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Andrew R. McCurdy."

GARETTA L. HODGKINS.

The bill (S. 4775) granting a pension to Garrett L. Hodgkiss was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the letter "L," to strike out the name "Hodgkiss" and insert "Hodgkins;" and in line 7, before the word "late," to strike out "Hodgkiss" and insert "Hodgkins;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Garrett L. Hodgkins, widow of Samuel P. Hodgkins, late of Company H, Thirty-second Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Garrett L. Hodgkins."

ROSETTE E. S. GROW.

The bill (S. 4673) granting an increase of pension to Rosette E. S. Grow was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "Battery," to insert "Independent;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Rosette E. S. Grow, widow of John A. Grow, late captain Twenty-fifth Independent Battery, New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH E. GILLETTE.

The bill (S. 41) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Gillette was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, before the word "surgeon," to insert "assistant surgeon and;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "seventeen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah E. Gillette, widow of Fidelio B. Gillette, late assistant surgeon and surgeon

Ninth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANGELINE B. WHITNEY.

The bill (S. 4675) granting a pension to Angeline B. Whitney was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "eight;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Angeline B. Whitney, widow of Amasa S. Whitney, late of Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY SMITH.

The bill (H. R. 13658) granting an increase of pension to Henry Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry Smith, late of Company I, Ninety-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MICHAEL MARX.

The bill (H. R. 8917) granting an increase of pension to Michael Marx was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Michael Marx, late of Company B, Fifty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REBECCA V. MACKENZIE.

The bill (H. R. 15244) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca V. Mackenzie was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Rebecca V. Mackenzie, widow of John A. Mackenzie, alias James Innis, late captain Company E, Seventy-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES T. WOLVERTON.

The bill (H. R. 14936) granting an increase of pension to James T. Wolverton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James T. Wolverton, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. HARTLEY.

The bill (H. R. 3831) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hartley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John W. Hartley, late of Company H, Eighth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATTHEW F. LOCKE.

The bill (S. 6155) granting an increase of pension to Matthew F. Locke was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Matthew F. Locke, late of Company F, First Regiment Mississippi Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY E. CHAMBERLAIN.

The bill (S. 4025) granting a pension to Mary E. Chamberlain was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary E. Chamberlain, widow of Jabez Chamberlain, late of Thirteenth Battery Michigan Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month, with \$2 per month additional on account of the minor child of said Jabez Chamberlain until she reaches the age of 16 years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH REESE.

The bill (H. R. 11090) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Reese was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph Reese, late captain Company K, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WASHINGTON I. COOK.

The bill (H. R. 130) granting an increase of pension to Washington I. Cook was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Washington I. Cook, late of Company I, Tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserve Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNIE M. WALLACE.

The bill (H. R. 4242) granting an increase of pension to Annie M. Wallace was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Annie M. Wallace, widow of Jeremiah Wallace, late of Company B, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL B. BARTLEY.

The bill (H. R. 11492) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Bartley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel B. Bartley, late of Company A, Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NICHOLS M. BROCKWAY.

The bill (H. R. 12818) granting a pension to Nichols M. Brockway was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Nichols M. Brockway, late captain Company G, Fifty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Emergency Militia, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADAM E. KING.

The bill (S. 6218) granting an increase of pension to Adam E. King was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Adam E. King, late captain and major and assistant adjutant-general and brevet brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH V. MATLACK.

The bill (S. 4850) granting an increase of pension to Sarah V. Matlack was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to

the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah V. Matlack, widow of William H. Matlack, late surgeon Thirteenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM PENN MACK.

The bill (S. 2193) granting a pension to William Penn Mack was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Penn Mack, late of Company E, Fiftieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month, the same to be paid him without deduction on account of former alleged overpayments or erroneous payments of pension.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARTHUR F. McNALLY.

The bill (S. 3731) granting an increase of pension to Arthur F. McNally was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "seventeen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Arthur F. McNally, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

URSULA BAYARD.

The bill (S. 6029) granting a pension to Ursula Bayard was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ursula Bayard, helpless and dependent daughter of George A. Bayard, late captain Company H and major One hundred and forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA J. PATTERSON.

The bill (S. 4749) granting a pension to Martha J. Patterson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" and in the same line, after the word "month," to insert "in lieu of that she is now receiving;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Martha J. Patterson, widow of William H. Patterson, late captain Company A, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Patterson."

MATTHEW H. BEVAN.

The bill (H. R. 12254) granting an increase of pension to Matthew H. Bevan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of

Matthew H. Bevan, late of Company A, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES L. OLMSTED.

The bill (H. R. 15762) granting an increase of pension to James L. Olmsted was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James L. Olmsted, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AARON FANSHAW.

The bill (H. R. 14662) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Fanshaw was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Aaron Fanshaw, late of Company E, Twenty-ninth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WARREN F. BARNES.

The bill (H. R. 1901) granting an increase of pension to Warren F. Barnes was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Warren F. Barnes, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH WARDLE.

The bill (H. R. 11015) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wardle was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph Wardle, late of Company G, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN BRASCH.

The bill (H. R. 1286) granting an increase of pension to John Brasch was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Brasch, late of Company M, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEWIS TOWNSEND.

The bill (H. R. 2993) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Townsend was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Lewis Townsend, late of Company B, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALFRED W. DEARBORN.

The bill (H. R. 14889) granting an increase of pension to Alfred W. Dearborn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alfred W. Dearborn, late of Company B, Third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL P. SHORT.

The bill (H. R. 11016) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Short was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel P. Short, late of Company B, Fifty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY S. AUSTIN.

The bill (H. R. 9696) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Austin was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry S. Austin, late of Company A, Twenty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM LANCE.

The bill (H. R. 9621) granting an increase of pension to William Lance was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Lance, late of Company C, One hundred and tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NAPOLEON B. WING.

The bill (H. R. 14799) granting an increase of pension to Napoleon B. Wing was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Napoleon B. Wing, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY FLYNN.

The bill (H. R. 10360) granting an increase of pension to Mary Flynn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary Flynn, widow of Patrick Flynn, late of Company C, Ninety-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY ELIZABETH MCCLAREN.

The bill (S. 6134) granting a pension to Mary Elizabeth McClaren was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "dependent," to strike out "daughter" and insert "child;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Elizabeth McClaren, blind and dependent child of James McClaren, late of Company F, Thirty-fifth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FOSTER W. GASSETT.

The bill (S. 5865) granting an increase of pension to Foster W. Gasset was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "musician," to insert "band;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Foster W. Gasset, late musician, band, Thirteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSAN E. BELLOWES.

The bill (S. 3934) granting a pension to Susan E. Bellows was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "a paymaster in the" and insert "pay director;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Susan E. Bellows, widow of Edward Bellows, late pay director, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEPHEN GILBERT.

The bill (S. 3194) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Gilbert was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Stephen Gilbert, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH F. KELLY.

The bill (S. 4492) restoring the name of Joseph Kelly, late of Troop I, Second United States Cavalry, to the pension roll, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Joseph F. Kelly, late of Troop I, Second Regiment United States Cavalry.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Joseph F. Kelly."

JOHN G. HASKELL.

The bill (S. 173) granting an increase of pension to John G. Haskell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John G. Haskell, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN O'KIEF.

The bill (S. 6414) granting an increase of pension to John Kief was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, before the word "late," to strike out the name "Kief" and insert "O'Kief;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John O'Kief, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to John O'Kief."

JOEL CARPENTER.

The bill (S. 3389) granting an increase of pension to Joel V. Carpenter was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the name "Carpenter," to strike out the letter "V;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Joel Carpenter, late of Company C, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Joel Carpenter."

HUGH R. BARNARD.

The bill (S. 5240) granting an increase of pension to Hugh R. Barnard was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "steward;" to insert "United States steamer Catskill;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Hugh R. Barnard, late paymaster's steward, United States steamer Catskill, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EUGENE P. TEWKSBURY.

The bill (H. R. 4927) granting an increase of pension to Eugene P. Tewksbury was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Eugene P. Tewksbury, late of Company B, Seventh Squadron Rhode Island Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETER WILLIAMS.

The bill (H. R. 9552) granting an increase of pension to Peter Williams was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Peter Williams, late of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HATTIE L. RICH.

The bill (H. R. 9553) granting an increase of pension to Hattie L. Rich was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hattie L. Rich, widow of Albert L. Rich, late of Company F, Fifth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY E. WRIGHT.

The bill (H. R. 13910) granting a pension to Henry E. Wright was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henry E. Wright, late of Fourth Unattached Company Massachusetts Militia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$10 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL B. COE.

The bill (H. R. 10680) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Coe was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel B. Coe, late of Company C, and hospital steward, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM HAYES.

The bill (H. R. 9824) granting a pension to William Hayes was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Hayes, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment United States Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCIS M. PREWETT.

The bill (H. R. 15308) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Prewett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Francis M. Prewett, late of Company F, First Regiment Texas

Volunteer Riflemen, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN S. PARKER.

The bill (H. R. 8049) granting an increase of pension to John S. Parker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John S. Parker, late of Company F, Seventieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS CONROY.

The bill (S. 6439) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Conroy was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas Conroy, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACOB H. HECK.

The bill (S. 3378) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Heck was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jacob H. Heck, late of Company F, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN SPRIGGS.

The bill (S. 2256) granting an increase of pension to John Spriggs was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Spriggs, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM BARKIS.

The bill (S. 2986) granting an increase of pension to William Barkis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Barkis, late of Company E, Fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM A. WILKINS.

The bill (S. 3662) granting an increase of pension to William A. Wilkins was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William A. Wilkins, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS M. CLARK.

The bill (S. 6097) granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Clark was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and Company G, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas M. Clark, late of Company G, Forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and Company G, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLEN ORR.

The bill (S. 2674) granting a pension to Ellen Orr was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twelve" and insert "eight;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ellen Orr, widow of Thomas J. Orr, late of Company A, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN H. STUBBS.

The bill (S. 4681) granting an increase of pension to John H. Stubbs was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John H. Stubbs, late of Company C, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM W. ROLLINS.

The bill (S. 2291) granting an increase of pension to William W. Rollins was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "Volunteer," to insert "Mounted;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William W. Rollins, late of Company B, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIZZIE A. HOLDEN.

The bill (S. 6445) granting an increase of pension to Lizzie A. Holden was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "Veteran," to insert "Regiment;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lizzie A. Holden, widow of Frank B. Holden, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and Company B, First Regiment Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETH LEWIS.

The bill (S. 6098) granting an increase of pension to Seth Lewis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "Company," to insert "Company G, Thirteenth Regiment, and;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Seth Lewis, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment, and Company M, Sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIMEON V. SHERWOOD.

The bill (S. 6605) granting an increase of pension to Simeon V. Sherwood was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Simeon V. Sherwood, late of Eighth Independent Battery, Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MOSES FROST.

The bill (S. 6699) granting an increase of pension to Moses Frost was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Moses Frost, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. McCUMBER. I hope the Senate will not concur in the amendment of the committee. The report in this case shows that the soldier served during the entire war, from 1861 until October 9, 1865. He is utterly helpless, bedridden, and requires the attention of a nurse at all times. He is nearly 80 years of age, and will probably live but a very few years or months longer.

I ask the Senate not to concur in the amendment, and that the bill be passed so as to pension the soldier at the rate of \$50 per month.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Pensions.

The amendment was not agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M'GOWAN.

The bill (S. 6446) granting an increase of pension to John McGowan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John McGowan, late of Company I, Second Regiment United States Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, or-

dered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MELKERT H. BURTON.

The bill (S. 6444) granting an increase of pension to Melkert H. Burton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Melkert H. Burton, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SANFORD S. HENDERSON.

The bill (S. 3023) granting an increase of pension to Sanford S. Henderson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sanford S. Henderson, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CYRELL BOUTIETTE.

The bill (S. 6438) granting a pension to Cyrell Boutiette was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Cyrell Boutiette, late scout and guide in the military service of the United States, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATHANIEL SALG.

The bill (S. 6718) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Salg was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Nathaniel Salg, late of Company G, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID A. MILLER.

The bill (H. R. 17241) granting an increase of pension to David A. Miller was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David A. Miller, late of Company D, One hundred and thirty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM E. WHEELER.

The bill (H. R. 13082) granting an increase of pension to William E. Wheeler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William E. Wheeler, late of Company C, Tenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL SHAFER.

The bill (H. R. 5383) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shafer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel Shafer, late of Company D, Tenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JONATHAN STEWART.

The bill (H. R. 5153) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Stewart was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jonathan Stewart, late of Company I, Seventy-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADAM HAND.

The bill (H. R. 4942) granting an increase of pension to Adam Hand was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Adam Hand, late

first lieutenant Company B, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMPSON T. GROVE.

The bill (H. R. 2476) granting an increase of pension to Sampson T. Grove was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sampson T. Grove, late of Company L, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTIN L. PEMBLETON.

The bill (H. R. 1491) granting an increase of pension to Martin L. Pembleton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Martin L. Pembleton, late of Company A, One hundred and fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES W. YOUNG.

The bill (H. R. 968) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Young was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles W. Young, late of Company B, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AVA D. BENJAMIN.

The bill (H. R. 963) granting an increase of pension to Ava D. Benjamin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ava D. Benjamin, late of Company B, Second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VINCENT M. CARTWRIGHT.

The bill (H. R. 606) granting an increase of pension to Vincent M. Cartwright was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Vincent M. Cartwright, late of Company C, Sixty-fifth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS SKIDMORE.

The bill (H. R. 1324) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Skidmore was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas Skidmore, late of Company C, Ninety-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN ELLIS.

The bill (H. R. 1445) granting an increase of pension to John Ellis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Ellis, late of Company C, One hundred and nineteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM STONE.

The bill (H. R. 2469) granting an increase of pension to William Stone was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Stone, late of Company I, Thirteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALEXANDER MOORE.

The bill (H. R. 14635) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Moore was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alexander Moore, late of Company F, Ninetieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARVIN WELTON.

The bill (H. R. 15872) granting an increase of pension to Marvin Welton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Marvin Welton, late of Company F, Second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCIS SCOTT.

The bill (H. R. 7987) granting an increase of pension to Francis Scott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Francis Scott, late of Company B, Twenty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$55 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT WEBB.

The bill (H. R. 2946) granting an increase of pension to Albert Webb was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Albert Webb, late of Company B, Fourteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETER W. KREEGER.

The bill (H. R. 2046) granting an increase of pension to Peter W. Kreeger was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Peter W. Kreeger, late of Company K, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OBADIAH J. MERRILL.

The bill (H. R. 5286) granting an increase of pension to Obadiah J. Merrill was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Obadiah J. Merrill, late of Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JESSE SIMS.

The bill (H. R. 7074) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Sims was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jesse Sims, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALICE W. T. GROESBECK.

The bill (H. R. 16109) granting a pension to Alice W. T. Groesbeck was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alice W. T. Groesbeck, widow of Stephen W. Groesbeck, late brigadier-general, United States Army, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN LEONARD.

The bill (H. R. 15871) granting an increase of pension to John Leonard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Leonard, late of Company E, Ninety-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M. PORTER.

The bill (H. R. 14489) granting an increase of pension to John M. Porter was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John M. Porter, late second lieutenant and captain Company A, Thirty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID C. POSEY.

The bill (H. R. 8708) granting an increase of pension to David C. Posey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David C. Posey, late of Company B, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCIS M. HAY.

The bill (H. R. 4322) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Hay was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Francis M. Hay, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVA M. KINGSBURY.

The bill (H. R. 666) granting an increase of pension to Eva M. Kingsbury was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Eva M. Kingsbury, widow of Frederick W. Kingsbury, late captain, Second Regiment United States Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL K. WHITE.

The bill (H. R. 5884) granting an increase of pension to Samuel K. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel K. White, late of Company E, Fortieth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH F. McCUNE.

The bill (S. 1724) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. McCune was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to insert "assistant;" in line 7, before the word "Fourteenth," to strike out "of the;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "seventeen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Sarah F. McCune, widow of George W. McCune, late assistant surgeon Fourteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$17 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. BRANCH.

The bill (S. 3914) granting an increase of pension to John W. Branch was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "of" and insert "captain," and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John W. Branch, late captain Company G, Fifty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM SWEET.

The bill (S. 1560) granting an increase of pension to William Sweet was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 7, after the word "Infantry," to insert "and Company F, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry;" and in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Sweet, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company F, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GABRIEL H. ADAMS.

The bill (S. 3897) granting an increase of pension to G. H. Adams was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," to strike out the letter "G." and insert the name "Gabriel;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Gabriel H. Adams, late of Company C, Fifty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Gabriel H. Adams."

SAMUEL T. DICKSON.

The bill (S. 4680) granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Dixon was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the name "Samuel T.," to strike out the name "Dixon" and insert "Dickson;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel T. Dickson, late of Company F, Forty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Samuel T. Dickson."

JOEL W. NYE.

The bill (H. R. 7607) granting an increase of pension to John W. Nye was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," to strike out the name "John" and insert "Joel;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Joel W. Nye, late chaplain Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act granting a pension to Joel W. Nye."

JOSEPH M. WHITE.

The bill (H. R. 5951) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. White was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph M. White, late of Company H, Second Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS P. DUNN.

The bill (H. R. 9906) granting an increase of pension to Thomas P. Dunn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas P. Dunn, late of Company L, First Regiment Montana Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM B. ATWATER.

The bill (H. R. 15344) granting an increase of pension to William B. Atwater was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William B. Atwater, late of Company B, Ninth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID GUTHRIE.

The bill (H. R. 15722) granting an increase of pension to David Guthrie was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David Guthrie, late of Company I, One hundred and sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELMER C. JORDAN.

The bill (H. R. 16807) granting an increase of pension to Elmer C. Jordan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elmer C. Jordan, late second lieutenant Company I, Seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATRICK COTTER.

The bill (H. R. 16809) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Cotter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Patrick Cotter, late of Company A, Eleventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MORRIS DEL DOWANE.

The bill (H. R. 16311) granting an increase of pension to Morris Del Dowane was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "Infantry," to strike out "New York Volunteer" and insert "United States;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Morris Del Dowane, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment United States Infantry, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CALVIN C. GRIFFITH.

The bill (H. R. 15197) granting an increase of pension to Calvin C. Griffith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Calvin C. Griffith, late of Captain Hudspeth's company, Fremont's regiment, California Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MORGAN DWYER.

The bill (S. 3349) granting an increase of pension to Morgan Dwyer was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "Company," to strike out "private in" and insert "of;" and in line 8, before the

word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Morgan Dwyer, late of Company F, Third Regiment United States Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN HAMILTON.

The bill (S. 6381) granting an increase of pension to John Hamilton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Hamilton, late of Company D, First Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HERBERT E. FARNSWORTH.

The bill (S. 5813) granting an increase of pension to Herbert E. Farnsworth was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension roll the name of Herbert E. Farnsworth, late captain Company B, Tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BERNARD J. BOLDERMANN.

The bill (S. 5518) granting an increase of pension to Bernard J. Boldermann was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Bernard J. Boldermann, late of Battery A, First Battalion California Volunteer Heavy Artillery, war with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL K. LONG.

The bill (S. 5819) granting an increase of pension to Samuel K. Long was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel K. Long, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH MORT.

The bill (S. 5253) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Mort was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Joseph Mort, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT CLARKE.

The bill (H. R. 6310) granting an increase of pension to Robert Clarke was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert Clarke, late captain Company F, First Regiment District Columbia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHNSON ANDERSON.

The bill (H. R. 16348) granting an increase of pension to Johnson Anderson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Johnson Anderson, late of Company H, One hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL SHADMAN.

The bill (H. R. 15850) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shadman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel Shadman, late of Company E, One hundred and thirty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HELEN CALVERT.

The bill (H. R. 16715) granting an increase of pension to Helen Calvert was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Helen Calvert, helpless and dependent daughter of Washington Calvert, late of Company F, Sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREDERICK M. HALBRITTER.

The bill (H. R. 16481) granting an increase of pension to Frederick M. Halbritter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Frederick M. Halbritter, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HIRAM QUALK.

The bill (H. R. 5243) granting an increase of pension to Hiram Qualk was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Hiram Qualk, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL B. GRAY.

The bill (H. R. 16506) granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Gray was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel B. Gray, late of Company E, Eighty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY A. JOHNS.

The bill (H. R. 5821) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Johns was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Mary A. Johns, widow of Frederick W. Johns, late of Company C, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JESSE PETERS.

The bill (H. R. 16683) granting a pension to Jesse Peters was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jesse Peters, late of Company F, Ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES A. M'CLUNG.

The bill (H. R. 15893) granting an increase of pension to James A. McClung was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James A. McClung, late of Company G, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLEN RIGGS.

The bill (H. R. 16173) granting an increase of pension to Allen Riggs was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Allen Riggs, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH HODGSON.

The bill (H. R. 4900) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Hodgson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah Hodgson, widow of John P. Hodgson, late of Company G, Forty-eighth Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES D. FORTNEY.

The bill (H. R. 4595) granting an increase of pension to Charles D. Fortney was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles D. Fortney, late assistant surgeon, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES GWYN.

The bill (H. R. 16194) granting an increase of pension to James Gwyn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James Gwyn, late colonel One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACOB COCHRAN.

The bill (H. R. 3373) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Cochran was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jacob Cochran, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Provisional Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES P. GRIFFITH.

The bill (H. R. 132) granting an increase of pension to James P. Griffith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James P. Griffith, late of Company F, Ninety-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES H. SILCOTT.

The bill (H. R. 16483) granting an increase of pension to James H. Silcott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James H. Silcott, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EVELINE V. FERGUSON.

The bill (H. R. 5822) granting an increase of pension to Eveline V. Ferguson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Eveline V. Ferguson, widow of William J. Ferguson, late a gunner, United States Navy, and to pay her a pension of \$18 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESTON GLOVER.

The bill (H. R. 16480) granting an increase of pension to Preston Glover was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Preston Glover, late of Company H, Third Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUGUSTUS COLVIN.

The bill (H. R. 9860) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Colvin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Augustus Colvin, late of Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS J. BROOKS.

The bill (H. R. 4169) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Brooks was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas J. Brooks, late of Company E, Seventy-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. STRAYER.

The bill (H. R. 15760) granting an increase of pension to John W. Strayer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John W. Strayer, late of Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SILAS W. SQUIRES.

The bill (H. R. 13620) granting an increase of pension to Silas W. Squires was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Silas W. Squires, late of Company A, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES M. PRINCE.

The bill (H. R. 9774) granting an increase of pension to James M. Prince was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James M. Prince, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW S. RAY.

The bill (H. R. 16108) granting an increase of pension to Andrew S. Ray was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Andrew S. Ray, late of Company A, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH W. TYLER.

The bill (H. R. 16303) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Tyler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph W. Tyler, late of Company K, Thirteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEPHEN GIRARD NICHOLS.

The bill (S. 6026) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Girard Nichols was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike

out "forty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Stephen Girard Nichols, late of Company D, Twenty-seventh Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOBIAS MEADER.

The bill (S. 5059) granting an increase of pension to Tobias Meader was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Tobias Meader, late of Company C, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS PICKFORD.

The bill (S. 5316) granting a pension to Thomas Pickford was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas Pickford, late hospital steward, United States Army, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN A. SARGENT.

The bill (S. 5960) granting an increase of pension to John A. Sargent was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John A. Sargent, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD B. DICKINSON.

The bill (S. 6344) granting an increase of pension to Richard B. Dickinson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Richard B. Dickinson, late of Company E, Battalion Mississippi Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACOB R. SHARRETT.

The bill (H. R. 15660) granting an increase of pension to Jacob R. Sharretts was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jacob R. Sharretts, late first lieutenant Company K, Two hundred and sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY W. GAY.

The bill (S. 2031) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Gay was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry W. Gay, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM SARTWELL.

The bill (S. 6188) granting an increase of pension to William Sartwell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-five" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William Sartwell, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY C. BUCK.

The bill (S. 4573) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Buck was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary C. Buck, widow of John A. Buck, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISAAC SLATER.

The bill (S. 6475) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Slater was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Isaac Slater, late of Company D, Sixteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS L. SANBORN.

The bill (S. 3953) granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Sanborn was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas L. Sanborn, late first lieutenant Company D, Eleventh Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAURA E. CAMPBELL.

The bill (S. 6586) granting an increase of pension to Laura E. Campbell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "sixteen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Laura E. Campbell, widow of William H. Campbell, late of Company A, Second Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSAN A. REYNOLDS.

The bill (S. 5233) granting an increase of pension to Susan A. Reynolds was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Susan A. Reynolds, widow of Daniel Reynolds, late second lieutenant Captain Cunningham's company, North Carolina Volunteers, Cherokee Indian war, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES W. COWING.

The bill (S. 6728) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Cowing was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty-six" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles W. Cowing, late of Company K, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARCIA H. EDGERLY.

The bill (S. 4814) granting an increase of pension to Marcia H. Edgerly was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-four" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Marcia H. Edgerly, widow of Samuel H. Edgerly, late of Company F, Twenty-seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEPHEN A. COX.

The bill (S. 6526) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Cox was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "Company," to strike out "of" and insert "first lieutenant;" and in line 7, before the word "Heavy," to insert "New York Volunteer;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Stephen A. Cox, late first lieutenant Company H, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RICHARD E. HYDE.

The bill (S. 6348) granting an increase of pension to Richard Edmund Hyde was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Richard E. Hyde, late of Company E, Third Regiment Missouri Mounted Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Richard E. Hyde."

BELLE K. THEAKER.

The bill (S. 6025) granting an increase of pension to Belle K. Theaker was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Belle K. Theaker, widow of Hugh A. Theaker, late colonel Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PERLEY B. DICKERSON.

The bill (S. 5322) granting an increase of pension to Perley B. Dickerson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "captain" and insert "first lieutenant;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Perley B. Dickerson, late first lieutenant Company H, Thirteenth Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN AYLERS.

The bill (S. 2464) granting an increase of pension to John Aylers was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Aylers, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN R. LEAVENS.

The bill (S. 5234) granting an increase of pension to John R. Leavens was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John R. Leavens, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE SIMMS.

The bill (S. 4123) granting an increase of pension to George Simms was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George Simms, late of U. S. S. Sassacus, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORIN P. STOFFER.

The bill (H. R. 4552) granting an increase of pension to Orin P. Stoffer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Orin P. Stoffer, late of Company A, First Regiment Ohio Volunteer Light Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALTA MIRA PARSONS.

The bill (H. R. 2781) granting an increase of pension to Alta Mira Parsons was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alta Mira Parsons, widow of Albert D. Parsons, late captain Company B, Ninety-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARGARET LA PARLE.

The bill (H. R. 15864) granting an increase of pension to Margaret La Parle was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Margaret La Parle, widow of Eli La Parle, late of Company C, Seventh Regiment, and Company B, First Regiment, Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN WALZ.

The bill (H. R. 16259) granting an increase of pension to John Walz was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Walz, late of Company A, Ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES B. JUDSON.

The bill (H. R. 4676) granting an increase of pension to James B. Judson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James B. Judson, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LLEWELLYN NILES.

The bill (H. R. 16263) granting an increase of pension to Llewellyn Niles was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Llewellyn Niles, late of Company G, Sixty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACOB A. KRYER.

The bill (H. R. 16594) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Kryer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jacob A. Kryer, late of Company A, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAHALA FORKNER.

The bill (S. 1452) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Forkner was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "a private in" and insert "of;" in line 7, before the word "Kentucky," to insert "Regiment;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mahala Forkner, widow of Owen Forkner, late of Company B, Fifty-third

Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORENCE EMERY BLAKE.

The bill (H. R. 16053) granting an increase of pension to Florence Emery Blake was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Florence Emery Blake, widow of John W. Blake, late major, Forty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTIN GILLETT.

The bill (S. 6554) granting an increase of pension to Martin Gillett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Martin Gillett, late of Company L, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA L. BARTLESON.

The bill (S. 4619) granting an increase of pension to Anna L. Bartleson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Anna L. Bartleson, widow of William Bartleson, late of Companies A and B, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Anna L. Bartleson."

JANE JOHNS.

The bill (S. 6550) granting a pension to Jane Johns was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 10, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twelve" and insert "eight;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jane Johns, widow of William W. Johns, late of Captain Jernigan's company, Florida Volunteers, Seminole Indian disturbance of 1849 to 1852, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEPHEN DAMPIER.

The bill (S. 6654) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Dampier was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, before the word "Indian," to insert "Seminole;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Stephen Dampier, late of Captain J. G. Dell's company, Florida Volunteers, Seminole Indian war, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES T. WEST.

The bill (S. 6549) granting an increase of pension to Charles T. West was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with

an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles T. West, late of Company H, Fourth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and second lieutenant, Company C, Third Regiment United States Colored Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEVINEY WALKER.

The bill (S. 6548) granting an increase of pension to Leviney Walker was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "and," to strike out "Infantry" and insert "Cavalry;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Leviney Walker, widow of Allen T. Walker, late of Company A, Second Regiment Florida Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ORLANDO KENNEDY.

The bill (S. 6553) granting an increase of pension to Orlando Kennedy was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Orlando Kennedy, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES H. CATE.

The bill (S. 4101) granting an increase of pension to James H. Cate was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of James H. Cate, late of Company B, Twenty-sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM C. POLLARD.

The bill (H. R. 2191) granting an increase of pension to William C. Pollard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William C. Pollard, late of Company C, Twenty-second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALFREDA B. COBURN.

The bill (H. R. 16666) granting an increase of pension to Alfreda B. Coburn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alfreda B. Coburn, widow of Charles R. Coburn, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Lillian S. Coburn, helpless and dependent child of said Charles R. Coburn, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Alfreda B. Coburn the name of said Lillian S. Coburn shall be placed on the pension roll at \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Alfreda B. Coburn.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RUTH M. SHEPLEY, NOW HASKELL.

The bill (H. R. 13170) granting an increase of pension to Ruth M. Shepley, now Haskell, was considered as in Committee

of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Ruth M. Shepley, now Haskell, dependent mother of Roscoe Shepley, alias Enoch F. Cutts, late of Company A, Thirty-first Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH NEILAN.

The bill (H. R. 4194) granting a pension to Elizabeth Neilan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Elizabeth Neilan, widow of Michael H. Neilan, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month and \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said Michael H. Neilan until they reach the age of 16 years.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACOB F. FRENCH.

The bill (H. R. 3286) granting an increase of pension to Jacob F. French was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jacob F. French, late of Company C, Twenty-third Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M'KENZIE.

The bill (H. R. 4873) granting an increase of pension to John McKenzie was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John McKenzie, late of Company B, Thirtieth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL TILLINGHAST.

The bill (H. R. 3002) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Tillinghast was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Samuel Tillinghast, late of U. S. S. *Ohio*, *North Carolina*, and *Crusader*, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS SMART.

The bill (H. R. 723) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Smart was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Thomas Smart, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEREMIAH CONNOR, ALIAS JAMES BOONE.

The bill (H. R. 16894) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Connor, alias James Boone, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Jeremiah Connor, alias James Boone, late of the U. S. S. *North Carolina* and *Monticello*, United States Navy, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CYRUS HURD.

The bill (H. R. 1573) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Hurd was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Cyrus Hurd, late of Company F, First Regiment Maine Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and unassigned Veteran Reserve Corps, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES H. WARNER.

The bill (H. R. 15782) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Warner was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles H. Warner, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRANVILLE F. PLUMMER.

The bill (H. R. 15781) granting an increase of pension to Granville F. Plummer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Granville F. Plummer, late of Company H, Eighteenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HORATIO W. LONGA.

The bill (H. R. 15786) granting an increase of pension to Horatio W. Longa was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Horatio W. Longa, late of Company M, First Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES J. RICHARDS.

The bill (H. R. 15783) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Richards was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles J. Richards, late first lieutenant Company I, Ninth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH WINGATE.

The bill (H. R. 15784) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wingate was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph Wingate, late of Company A, Fourth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM H. CRAY.

The bill (H. R. 15930) granting an increase of pension to William H. Cray was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William H. Cray, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES J. ESTY.

The bill (H. R. 8859) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Esty was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles J. Esty, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH D. TARVER.

The bill (H. R. 16171) granting an increase of pension to Sarah D. Tarver was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah D. Tarver, widow of Edmund Tarver, late of Captain Curtis's company, Raiford's battalion, Alabama Volunteer Infantry, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUIS SHERARD.

The bill (H. R. 16904) granting a pension to Louis Sherard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Louis Sherard, late first lieutenant Company G, Third Regiment Alabama Volunteer Infantry, war with Spain, and to pay him a pension of \$8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA F. FIELD.

The bill (H. R. 15892) granting an increase of pension to Martha F. Field was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Martha F. Field, widow of Benjamin S. Field, late of Company C, First

Regiment Kentucky Mounted Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGIA A. WARREN.

The bill (H. R. 16172) granting an increase of pension to Georgia A. Warren was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Georgia A. Warren, widow of Reuben L. Warren, late of Captain Smith's company, Third Regiment Texas Mounted Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMFORT W. WATSON.

The bill (S. 4073) granting an increase of pension to Comfort W. Watson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Comfort W. Watson, widow of Robert S. Watson, late of Company E, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY A. MASSEY.

The bill (S. 4886) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Massey was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 10, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twelve" and insert "eight;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary A. Massey, widow of William T. Massey, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and Capt. Robert Milligan's independent company Delaware Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PATRICK DUFFY.

The bill (S. 5903) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Duffy was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Fourth," to insert "Regiment United States;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Patrick Duffy, late of Battery L, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN W. VICTOR.

The bill (S. 3722) granting an increase of pension to John W. Victor was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars" to strike out "twenty" and insert "twelve;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John W. Victor, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FANNIE C. AVIS.

The bill (S. 6171) granting an increase of pension to Fannie C. Avis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Fannie C. Avis, widow of Edward S. Avis, late first lieutenant, Eighteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and captain, United States Army, retired, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUCY M'E. ANDREWS.

The bill (S. 3044) granting an increase of pension to Lucy McEntee Andrews was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lucy McE. Andrews, widow of John N. Andrews, late colonel Twelfth Regiment United States Infantry, and brigadier-general, United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to Lucy McE. Andrews."

BENJAMIN F. SHEPPARD.

The bill (S. 6346) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Sheppard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Benjamin F. Sheppard, late of Company A, First Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES W. MARTIN.

The bill (H. R. 16157) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Martin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles W. Martin, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID ROTHSCHELL.

The bill (H. R. 15030) granting an increase of pension to David Rothschell was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of David Rothschell, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FELIX MONAGHAN.

The bill (H. R. 17093) granting an increase of pension to Felix Monaghan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Felix Monaghan, late of Company H, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM Y. CLINTON.

The bill (H. R. 14140) granting an increase of pension to William Y. Clinton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of William Y. Clinton, late of Company E, Eighty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FREDERICK HARK.

The bill (H. R. 16260) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Hark was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Frederick Hark, late of Company D, First Regiment New York Volunteer Veteran Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH M'GUCKIAN.

The bill (H. R. 16190) granting an increase of pension to Joseph McGuckian was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Joseph McGuckian, late of general service, United States Army, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN MORGAN.

The bill (H. R. 16124) granting an increase of pension to John Morgan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Morgan, late of Company A, Twenty-fifth Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRIETTA WEIDNER.

The bill (H. R. 10712) granting a pension to Henrietta Weidner was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Henrietta Weidner, widow of William N. Weidner, late first-class boy and coal heaver, U. S. S. *Scorpion*, United States Navy, war with Mexico, and to pay her a pension of \$8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALVIN B. FRANKLIN.

The bill (H. R. 16945) granting an increase of pension to Alvin B. Franklin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Alvin B. Franklin, late first lieutenant Company H, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIET H. BRADY.

The bill (H. R. 16087) granting an increase of pension to Harriet H. Brady was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Harriet H. Brady, widow of Thomas J. Brady, late major Eighth Regiment and colonel One hundred and fortieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MICHAEL LEWIS.

The bill (H. R. 16704) granting an increase of pension to Michael Lewis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Michael Lewis, late of Company L, Fourth Regiment United States Artillery, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOREN AUSTIN.

The bill (H. R. 15855) granting an increase of pension to Loren Austin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Loren Austin, late of Company A, Twenty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PETER HORTH.

The bill (H. R. 15733) granting an increase of pension to Peter Horth was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Peter Horth, late of Company I, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMMA CORTRIGHT.

The bill (H. R. 3799) granting a pension to Emma Cortright was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Emma Cortright, widow of George N. Cortright, late of Company D, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWIN O. PIERCE.

The bill (H. R. 15732) granting an increase of pension to Edwin O. Pierce was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Edwin O. Pierce, late of Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARIA ELDERED.

The bill (H. R. 5123) granting a pension to Maria Eldred, formerly Maria Olmstead, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Maria Eldred, formerly Maria Olmstead, late nurse, Medical Department, United States Volunteers, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH F. MATHISON.

The bill (H. R. 16387) granting an increase of pension to Sarah F. Mathison was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Sarah F. Mathison, widow of Samuel H. Mathison, late of the U. S. S. *Ohio* and *Mohican*, United States Navy, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN PARKS.

The bill (H. R. 16141) granting an increase of pension to John Parks was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John Parks, late captain and assistant quartermaster, United States Volunteers, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW J. CLARK.

The bill (H. R. 16077) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Clark was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Andrew J. Clark, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and Company C, Sixteenth Regiment United States Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHERINE E. RAY.

The bill (H. R. 16442) granting an increase of pension to Catherine E. Ray was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Catherine E. Ray, widow of Alfred C. Ray, late of Company D, Seventy-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and to pay her a pension of \$12 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EUGENE C. MOGER.

The bill (H. R. 16125) granting an increase of pension to Eugene C. Moger was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Eugene C. Moger, late of Company B, Fifty-sixth Regiment New York National Guard Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN WHITE.

The bill (H. R. 7000) granting an increase of pension to John White was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of John White, late of Company F, Thirty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and Company K, Twentieth Regiment New York

Volunteer Cavalry, and to pay him a pension of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN M. BYBEE.

The bill (S. 4508) granting an increase of pension to John M. Bybee was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John M. Bybee, late of Captain Hunter's company, Mormon Battalion Iowa Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL LEWIS.

The bill (S. 6402) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Lewis was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Samuel Lewis, late of Company C, Iowa Battalion, Mormon Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MATILDA J. HENDERSON.

The bill (S. 5499) granting a pension to Matilda J. Henderson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Matilda J. Henderson, widow of Hiram Henderson, late of the ships Ohio and United States, United States Navy, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY A. O'BRIEN.

The bill (S. 3372) granting a pension to Mary O'Brien, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary A. O'Brien, widow of Michael O'Brien, late of Company F, Twenty-first Regiment United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Mary A. O'Brien."

JAMES V. WILLIAMS.

The bill (S. 6042) granting an increase of pension to James B. Williams was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James V. Williams, late of Company E, Mormon Battalion, Iowa Volunteers, war with Mexico, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to James V. Williams."

CHARLES R. SCHMIDT.

The bill (S. 4605) granting an increase of pension to Charles R. Schmidt was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "of," to strike out "corporal" and insert "late;" and in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Charles R. Schmidt, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA T. HAMLIN.

The bill (S. 5344) granting a pension to Martha B. Hamlin was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Martha T. Hamlin, widow of Decatur Hamlin, late scout, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$8 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Martha T. Hamlin."

CHARLES NORRIS.

The bill (S. 6289) granting a pension to Charles Norris was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Charles Norris, late of the Third Regiment Kentucky Volunteers, war with Mexico, and to pay him a pension of \$12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to say in connection with the motion that a number of Senators spoke to me, and informed them it was my understanding that there would be no further business this evening after we got through with the Pension Calendar. But the Senator from Indiana informs me that it is his intention simply to call up one case to which there will be no objection.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 26, 1905, at 1 o'clock p. m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 25, 1905.

INDIAN AGENT.

Capt. Jeremiah Z. Dare, United States Army, retired, of the District of Columbia, to be agent for the Indians of the Black-foot Agency in Montana, vice James H. Monteath, resigned.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

Chaplain.

Rev. George J. Waring, of Iowa, to be chaplain, with the rank of first lieutenant, from January 24, 1905, vice Colbert, resigned.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Subsistence department.

Capt. Hugh J. Gallagher, commissary, to be commissary with the rank of major, from January 19, 1905, vice Baldwin, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate January 25, 1905.

POSTMASTER.

INDIANA.

Henry W. Bennett to be postmaster at Indianapolis, in the county of Marion and State of Indiana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 25, 1905.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by Rev. JOHN VAN SCHAIK, Jr.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SARAH A. ROWE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following Senate concurrent resolution; which was read, considered, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President be requested to return to the Senate the bill (S. 5501) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Rowe.

Attest:

CHARLES G. BENNETT, Secretary.

FORTIFICATIONS APPROPRIATION BILL.

Without objection, the Speaker laid before the House the bill (H. R. 17094) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. LITTAUER. Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER announced the following conferees on the part of the House: Mr. LITTAUER, Mr. MARSH, Mr. TAYLOR.

RAMON O. WILLIAMS AND JOSEPH A. SPRINGER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 2052) for the relief of Ramon O. Williams and Joseph A. Springer, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. GRAFF. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

REMOVAL OF SNOW AND ICE FROM SIDEWALKS, ETC., IN THE CITY OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report the following joint resolution, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 206) to provide for the removal of snow and ice from the cross walks and gutters of the District of Columbia.

Resolved, etc., That the sum of \$5,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the removal of snow and ice from the cross walks and gutters in the District of Columbia, one half of said sum to be paid out of the revenues of the District of Columbia and the other half out of the Treasury of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much money will that require?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Five thousand dollars is the amount appropriated in the joint resolution.

Mr. GILBERT. Why does not the city see to it like every other city? Why do we make a special appropriation for it?

Mr. HEMENWAY. I will ask the Clerk to read two letters from the Commissioners.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, January 6, 1905.

HON. JAMES A. HEMENWAY,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to invite your attention to the fact that on December 12 last they transmitted to you the text of a joint resolution authorizing an appropriation of \$10,000 for the removal of snow and ice from the streets, cross walks, and gutters in the District of Columbia. Up to the present time the Commissioners have not been notified of action upon the resolution, and they beg to inform you that the appropriation previously available for this work is exhausted and that if the desired appropriation is made the condition of the streets could be materially improved.

Very respectfully,

HENRY B. F. MACFARLAND,
President of the Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE,
COMMISSIONERS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, January 11, 1905.

HON. JAMES A. HEMENWAY,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to invite your attention to the fact that the draft of a joint resolution for an appropriation of \$10,000 for the removal of snow and ice from the streets, cross walks, and gutters in the District of Columbia has not yet received the favorable action of the House, and that the funds available for such work being exhausted, the Commissioners feel it their duty, in view of the prediction of approaching snow, to ask your cooperation in securing speedy action upon the resolution.

Very respectfully,

HENRY B. F. MACFARLAND,
President of the Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HEMENWAY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

REPRINT OF BILL.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reprint of the bill H. R. 17478.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the reprint of a House bill, the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 17478) to provide for an equal division of the lands and moneys of the Osage tribe of Indians, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

TEXAS CITY, TEX., A SUBPORT OF ENTRY IN THE CUSTOMS COLLECTION DISTRICT OF GALVESTON.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16799) making Texas City, Tex., a subport of entry in the customs collection district of Galveston.

Be it enacted, etc., That Texas City, in the State of Texas, be, and is hereby, made a subport of entry in the customs collection district of Galveston, and that the privileges of section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1880, governing the immediate transportation of dutiable goods without appraisement be, and the same are hereby, extended to such subport, and a deputy collector of customs shall be appointed, who shall reside at said subport.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I would like to hear what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] has to say on this.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will state that this bill has been unanimously reported by the Ways and Means Committee, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COOPER], a member of that committee, acquiesces in that report. I am informed, too, that the entire Texas delegation desire the passage of the bill. It is to make Texas City a subport of entry. I reported it by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDOX. Mr. Speaker, I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] about this bill.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand the bill offered by the gentleman from Minnesota, it is to make Texas City a subport of entry.

Mr. TAWNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, Texas City is not in my dis-

trict, and personally I have no knowledge of the conditions which make it necessary, but I have pleasure in assuring the House that if Mr. GREGG, who represents that district, has recommended the passage of the bill, or Mr. COOPER, who is a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, has recommended its passage, it should pass.

Mr. FINLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. FINLEY. Can the gentleman from Texas give the House any information as to about what will likely be the receipts at this port?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I can only say that they will exceed those of Beaufort, S. C.

Mr. FINLEY. You are sure of that?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAWNEY. With pleasure.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This bill merely enables loading and unloading to be done at Texas City, instead of forcing them to go all the way up to Galveston. The bill is all right, and was fully considered by the Committee on Ways and Means and ought to pass.

Mr. MADDOX. As a matter of inquiry, I would like to ask whether this requires any additional expense. How much is it going to cost to collect the customs, if that is the object of the bill?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is recommended by the Treasury Department, in addition to the recommendation of the Texas delegation, and it involves no more expense than having a deputy collector at Texas City, and that will not be necessary for some time yet. The attempt was made last summer to transact business at Texas City through the Galveston port and it was found impracticable.

I would also state that the report shows Texas City will handle a volume of traffic during the year 1905 of nearly 200,000 tons in the Mexican service alone. And it is estimated that at least 50,000 tons will be handled in exportations via Texas City, and importations from other foreign ports than Mexico, as arrangements have just been concluded for a trans-Atlantic service. The Government of the United States has appropriated and expended \$250,000 in improving the channel to Texas City Harbor, and unless it is now made a subport of entry the business can not be transacted there that was contemplated as a result of the deepening of the channel to this port. It is absolutely a necessity for the transaction of the business that will be done, or ought to be done and is desired to be done, at this place.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it seems to be appropriate at this time to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. TAWNEY] to page 28 of the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, of 1904, which is in substance a repetition of the year before, wherein he states:

CUSTOMS—CONSOLIDATION AND REORGANIZATION OF DISTRICTS.

Improved service and the extension of immediate-transportation privileges to certain parts of the country increased the expense of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year something over \$200,000 in round numbers. The average cost of collecting was \$0.033 per dollar—much more than it should be. Independent ports have been established where subports tributary to a larger central port would have been sufficient. These tributary ports are therefore now maintained as independent ports on an unbusinesslike basis. Much unnecessary expense could be eliminated by proper consolidation of small and expensive ports as subports dependent upon large self-supporting ports. Congress should do this or authorize the executive branch of the Government to reorganize the customs districts upon an economical and businesslike basis. Precedent for such authority is found in the act of Congress wherein the President is authorized to rearrange the internal-revenue districts.

In my last annual report I called attention to the relatively large expenditure incurred at various ports in collecting almost infinitesimal amounts of revenue. During the past year, at the following ports, it has cost more than a dollar to collect a dollar:

List of ports at which customs expenses exceed receipts.

Name of port.	Receipts.	Expenses.	Number employed.	Cost of collecting one dollar.
Alexandria, Va.	\$1,172.23	\$1,255.74	3	\$1.071
Annapolis, Md.	14.00	1,196.95	3	85.496
Apalachicola, Fla.	1,469.13	3,564.26	4	2.426
Barnstable, Mass.	448.35	3,624.09	7	8.083
Beaufort, N. C.	1.55	1,509.28	2	973.729
Beaufort, S. C.	1,377.27	3,413.26	4	2.478
Brazos (Brownsville), Tex.	4,850.66	32,004.59	26	6.598
Bridgeton, N. J.	723.51	1,494.80	6	2.066
Burlington, Iowa	91.11	504.75	2	5.540
Burlington (Trenton), N. J.	81.77	163.80	2	2.008
Castine, Me.	692.84	4,400.78	6	6.352
Chattanooga, Tenn.	90.80	519.95	2	5.726
Cherrystone (Cape Charles City), Va.	29.00	954.59	3	32.917

List of ports at which customs expenses exceed receipts—Continued.

Name of port.	Receipts.	Expenses.	Number employed.	Cost of collecting one dollar.
Eastern (Crisfield), Md.	\$22.70	\$2,707.88	2	\$119.290
Edgartown, Mass.	223.79	2,547.97	4	11.386
Frenchmans Bay (Ellsworth), Me.	323.84	3,606.65	5	11.137
Georgetown, S. C.	46.01	638.34	3	13.874
Gloucester, Mass.	15,284.39	17,814.00	14	1.166
Great Egg Harbor (Somers Point), N. J.	274.45	1,116.16	2	4.052
Humboldt (Eureka), Cal.	513.73	3,104.78	1	6.044
Kennebunk, Me.	31.00	51.00	2	1.645
La Crosse, Wis.	15.29	363.02	2	23.742
Machias, Me.	734.35	4,311.47	5	5.871
Michigan (Grand Haven), Mich.	5,488.43	9,005.79	14	1.641
Nantucket, Mass.	8.55	378.00	1	44.211
Newburyport, Mass.	59.20	556.30	2	9.397
New London, Conn.	1,934.63	5,111.45	5	2.642
Oregon (Astoria), Oreg.	13,297.45	13,812.78	13	1.039
Pamlico (Newbern), N. C.	1,203.60	5,902.45	5	4.904
Patchogue, N. Y.	10.00	488.60	2	48.860
Plymouth, Mass.	312.40	1,596.76	2	5.111
Portsmouth, N. H.	420.25	4,751.30	5	11.306
Rock Island, Ill.	16.66	716.95	2	43.034
Saco, Me.	13.40	439.30	2	32.828
Sag Harbor, N. Y.	616.27	1,142.49	3	1.854
St. Marys, Ga.	28.19	590.54	2	20.949
Salem and Beverly (Salem), Mass.	2,301.49	5,904.01	6	2.565
Sandusky, Ohio	2,130.96	4,287.04	9	2.012
Southern Oregon (Coos Bay), Oreg.	25.66	1,309.80	2	51.044
Tappahannock, Va.	30.00	762.41	2	25.414
Teche (Brashear), La.	77.90	3,029.75	3	38.893
Vicksburg, Miss.	415.75	625.50	1	1.505
Waldoboro, Me.	1,362.60	6,751.59	7	4.955
Wheeling, W. Va.	76.10	1,233.47	2	16.209
Wiscasset, Me.	738.86	3,233.43	3	4.376
York, Me.	2.50	263.56	1	105.424

I can not too strongly emphasize the need for systematic and economical reorganization of the customs service along the lines here suggested.

This table alphabetically arranged, and for the second time embraced in the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, states nearly fifty ports where it costs more than a dollar to collect a dollar. And the gentleman will be surprised at some of the amounts, if he has not already scanned the table. And I would like to ask the gentleman what he or his committee have done toward preventing this egregious blunder on the subject of economy in failing to dispense with these ports and continuing this condition of affairs.

Mr. TAWNEY. I sincerely regret that I am not able to understand the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] sufficiently to know to what his inquiry relates.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. My inquiry is this: The Secretary of the Treasury, in his last annual report and in his report for the present year, says that there are nearly fifty ports for the collection of revenue where it costs over a dollar, and in many instances more than \$50 and in others much more, to collect \$1. And I would inquire of the gentleman what his committee has done toward dispensing with these ports and saving this expenditure?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman that this is not one of the ports referred to by the Secretary in his annual report, because at the present time Texas City is not a port or a subport of entry.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is true, but—

Mr. TAWNEY. But this is a port now in the collection district at Galveston.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I understand that perfectly, but I am asking what the gentleman's committee has done to follow the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, who says that we can dispense with many of these collection ports, and that we should do so in the interest of business methods, because it costs more than a dollar at each of them to collect a dollar.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say that the Committee on Ways and Means has had the bill under consideration for some time, and has not yet come to any agreement on it. As soon as the committee can reach an agreement with respect to the bill now pending before it, it will be reported to the House, and the present districts will be reorganized.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. This condition has existed for two years, and I hope the gentleman—

Mr. TAWNEY. In my judgment it has existed for a longer time than that.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is to be observed, if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] will take the pains to look into it, that the question of the importance and value of a collection port, a port for the collection of duties upon imported goods, is not alone measured by the amount of money received upon im-

ports at that place. And the committee have found that while the comparative receipts and expenditures are as stated by the Secretary of the Treasury, nevertheless there are a great many ports that stand in the way of smuggling and against the entry of Chinese into the United States, and all that sort of thing, the value of which can not be fixed by the mere question of dollars and cents.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then I will ask if it is not a fact that a number of these places are not abandoned that are unnecessary because this action stands in the way of some favorite in employment? The Committee on Appropriations tried to follow the advice of the Secretary of the Treasury in reorganizing that service at the last session, but were not able to do it, and it went out on a point of order because of the same influence. I ask the gentleman why the committee has not carried out the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, in view of all the gentleman has said?

Mr. GROSVENOR. The committee found, because of the importance of the question, it necessitated careful investigation.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I suppose from the time when the Secretary made his recommendation that he had taken its importance into consideration. The Secretary understood the matter, and I assume was able to speak about it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That is the opinion of the gentleman, and the committee have a different opinion. And now we will be able to take into consideration the opinion of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. He suggested two places here where it costs \$105 to collect one. That is evidence of the necessity for a reorganization of that service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. That may be necessary to protect revenue amounting to \$100,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The Secretary of the Treasury says you should abandon these places, and that there should be a reorganization of the service.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The Secretary may be mistaken, as is the gentleman from Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to add, in confirmation of the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota, that it would be a public convenience and meet a public necessity to make this a subport of entry. I think the bill has met the approbation of the Texas delegation and the unanimous approval of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TAWNEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

THIRTEEN-AND-A-HALF STREET.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 15477) to change the name of Thirteen-and-a-half street to Linworth place, with Senate amendments, which were read.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended. There was no objection.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to change the name of Thirteen-and-a-half street to Linworth place."

TO PROVIDE FURTHER FOR THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by its title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14757) to further provide for the Presidential succession.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved January 19, 1886, entitled "An act to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of President in the case of the removal, death, resignation, or inability, both of the President and Vice-President," be amended by the insertion, after the word "Interior," of the following words: "Or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of Agriculture, or if there be none, or in case of his removal, death, resignation, or inability, then the Secretary of Commerce and Labor."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read a third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. GAINES of West Virginia, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FOREST RESERVE.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H. R. 8460.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to have the report read, or the statement?

Mr. LACEY. I think the statement will be sufficient, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the reading of the statement instead of the report?

Mr. CLARK. I would like to know what this is.

The SPEAKER. It is just about to be read.

Mr. CLARK. I reserve all points of order, and the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves all points of order on the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report and statement, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 8460, "An act providing for the transfer of forest reserves from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment, with an amendment as follows:

In section 2 of said amendment strike out the following words at the end thereof: "as any other wood or wood pulp;" so as to read:

"SEC. 2. That pulp wood or wood pulp manufactured from timber in the district of Alaska may be exported therefrom."

In section 4 insert the words "municipal or" before the words "mining purposes" in the fifth line; and in the eighth line strike out the words "Secretary of Agriculture" and insert in lieu thereof "Secretary of the Interior;" so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. That rights of way for the construction and maintenance of dams, reservoirs, water plants, ditches, flumes, pipes, tunnels, and canals within and across the forest reserves of the United States are hereby granted to citizens and corporations of the United States for municipal or mining purposes, and for the purposes of the milling and reduction of ores, during the period of their beneficial use, under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and subject to the laws of the State or Territory in which said reserves are, respectively, situated."

To amend section 5 by striking out the word "as," after the word "States," in line 5, and insert therein "and for a period of five years from the passage of this act shall constitute;" so as to read:

"SEC. 5. That all money received from the sale of any products, or the use of any land or resources of said forest reserves, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States, and for a period of five years from the passage of this act shall constitute a special fund available, until expended, as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, for the protection, administration, improvement, and extension of Federal forest reserves."

JOHN F. LACEY,

F. W. MONDELL,

F. M. GRIFFITH,

Managers on the part of the House.

GEO. C. PERKINS,

A. B. KITTREDGE,

PARIS GIBSON,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The effect of the above full agreement between the conference committees of the two Houses is as follows:

First. The Senate amendment in section 1 substitutes the words "execute or cause to be executed" for the original language of the bill which provides for the supervision of the execution. This change does not in any way affect the purposes of the bill and improves the phraseology.

Second. The change in section 2 of the amendment as agreed upon by the conference committee only strikes out an unnecessary expression without changing its effect.

Third. The effect of section 4 of the amendment, as modified by the amendment agreed to by your conferees, changes the nature of the rights of way for the construction and maintenance of dams, reservoirs, water plants, ditches, flumes, pipes, tunnels, and canals, for municipal and mining purposes and also for mill-

ing purposes in connection with mining and for the reduction of ores, during the period of their beneficial use, and as amended leaves the control of such grants and regulations with the Department of the Interior, where the same now is.

Section 5 of the amendment makes a continuing appropriation of the money received from the sale of the products or use of the land, which is to be covered into the United States Treasury and be available until expended, as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct. This section, as amended in the agreement of your conferees, limits such appropriation to five years from the passage of this act instead of making it a permanent and continuing appropriation. The effect of this will be to give a free hand to the Department of Agriculture for a few years during the inauguration of a system of administration, by which the necessary money for said purpose may be drawn directly from the receipts of the timber, etc., upon the reserves.

JOHN F. LACEY,
F. W. MONDELL,
F. M. GRIFFITH,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LACEY. Mr. Speaker, I shall explain, in a few words, the purpose of this bill. It is for the transfer of the administration of the forest reserves from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture. There are a few amendments which were placed on the bill by the Senate, and this is a full agreement of the conference committee in relation to those amendments. The statement which has been read, I believe, fully explains what the effect of the action recommended on the amendments will be, and if there is no question in regard to the bill I will ask for a vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Briefly explain what the effect of the amendments will be.

Mr. LACEY. In answer to the gentleman from Mississippi, I will say that the first amendment is a purely verbal one, without any effect on the meaning of the bill. The next was an amendment offered by the conference committee themselves, striking out the words "as any other wood or wood pulp." The matter left in authorizes the exportation of wood or wood pulp from Alaska, which is now prohibited by general law. The words eliminated by the conference committee were surplusage.

The next amendment is as to rights of way. The Senate made a provision that rights of way for ditches for mining purposes should be in the nature of an easement instead of, as at present, a mere license. The conference committee recommended that the section be amended by giving the same privilege to municipalities as is given to mining companies, because there are some towns which get their water power for electric lighting out of the ditches from forest reserves.

The next amendment is in relation to allowing the Secretary of Agriculture to use the receipts from the sale of timber, or other sources of income from the forest reserves, in the administration of the reserves. The Senate in their amendment provided a continuing appropriation without limit. The conferees on the part of the House thought that ought not to be done; that a continuing appropriation always involved more or less danger, and while it might be proper to have a continuing appropriation for a time until this law could be fairly put in operation, it ought to be limited; and so we agreed on a limited time of five years, at the end of which time the subject would have to come to Congress either for making further continuation of five years, or making it the subject thereafter of annual appropriation.

Mr. LIND. Is there any limit to the amount expendable in one year?

Mr. LACEY. It is limited to the amount of the receipts. No one knows exactly what the appropriation ought to be. Of course this authorization could be cut off in an appropriation bill in ensuing years. Instead of making enlarged appropriations out of the general fund, it was thought best to let them use the proceeds of the timber for the time being, until the cost of the administration could be more fully arrived at.

Mr. LIND. But suppose the Secretary should want to dispose of ten or fifteen million dollars' worth of timber, could all that money be used under a provision of that kind?

Mr. LACEY. I do not see how he could use it under existing law. He could only use it for administration of the forest reserves, and the cost of that administration is now pretty fully fixed by general law, as to the rates of salary and other expenses. There might be some incidental expenses in connection with the administration, and it was thought best to give him that right for a short time.

Mr. LIND. I do not object to that, but I think there ought to have been a money limit as well as a time limit.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and the conference report was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LACEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18123, the District appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. MANN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Hereafter the District of Columbia shall not be required, in judicial proceedings, to pay fees to the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, and the said District of Columbia and its Commissioners shall be entitled to institute and prosecute judicial proceedings in said court without the payment of fees.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the paragraph just read, on the ground that it changes existing law. Under the law as it now stands the District of Columbia is required to pay fees to the clerk of the supreme court in the same manner that private litigants are, and in fixing the emoluments of the clerk of the supreme court this source of revenue was taken into consideration. I do not know how much the total receipts of the clerk of the supreme court may be, whether they are too high or not, but there is no provision made for the reimbursement of the clerk of the court for the taking away of this source of revenue, and it seems to me this is not the proper way to handle questions of fees and salaries.

I am inclined to favor a salary plan of payment, but that question should come up before the proper committee, either the Committee on the Judiciary or the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I am satisfied that this paragraph is not in order. The same paragraph was in this bill last year and the point of order made against it and it went out, and it appears here now. Therefore I make the point of order against it.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Will not the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I will reserve the point of order if the gentleman wishes to address the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana reserves the point of order to paragraph beginning at line 16 and ending with line 21 on page 55.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, the paragraph was inserted by the committee for the purpose of correcting what the committee conceived to be a wrong. The original law contains this language:

Hereafter the District of Columbia shall not be required in judicial proceedings to pay fees to the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia or of the court of appeals of said District, or to the United States marshal of said District, for the service of process; and the said District of Columbia and its Commissioners shall be entitled to institute and prosecute legal proceedings in said courts without the payment of fees, and shall also be entitled to the services of said marshal in the service of all civil process without any payment of fees.

Then, in what is known as the "District Code," passed later and now law, we find this language:

The District of Columbia shall not be required to pay fees to the clerk of the court of appeals of the District or to the marshal of the District, and shall be entitled to the services of said marshal in the service of all civil processes.

That code was supposed to be largely a reenactment of existing law, but it will be noted that in the reenactment, while two of the three officers mentioned in the original law are within the requirements of the original law, this particular officer was omitted.

In section 179 of the code we find these words:

The salary and compensation of the clerk—

That is, this clerk now in question—

shall not exceed the sum of \$5,000 per annum, and the excess of fees received by him above said salary, after defraying thereout the necessary expenses of his office, shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States.

I want to call the attention of the Chair and of this committee to two points in that paragraph: First, that this man's salary has been fixed, not at \$3,500, which is the usual salary for the clerk of a United States court, but at \$5,000; second, that

provision is made that any excess of these fees, after defraying thereout the necessary expenses of his office, shall be turned over to the Treasury of the United States. He can readily make the expenses of the office use up all the fees above his salary.

So far as I know, Mr. Chairman, no member of the committee is acquainted with this officer, so the recommendation of the committee is entirely impersonal. We make our recommendation solely in what we conceive to be the public interest. We feel that in the making of the code a wrong was done in the omission of this gentleman from the list of those enumerated in the law to whom the District need not pay fees, and that wrong we here aim to correct.

I am free to admit that the point of order is well taken, if the gentleman insists upon it, and the whole purpose of my remarks is to try to induce him not to insist upon it.

The objection that we make, and the whole purpose of the paragraph, is to bring this gentleman within the original provisions of law. We are not objecting primarily to his getting this \$5,000 salary, although it is larger than the salary paid to any other officer performing similar service, but that these fees which are now paid by the District shall hereafter be remitted, as in the original law of which the code was supposed by Congress to be simply a codification.

Therefore I hope my friend will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the point of order ought to be made and insisted upon, because, among other things, the rules of the House are made to be respected, and the Committee on Appropriations ought to be the committee that gives the highest regard to the rules of the House.

I concede that in cases of emergency sometimes it may be a matter of policy to permit legislation to go into general appropriation bills and that points of order ought not to be made. I do not make points of order, as a rule, against legislating in appropriation bills, even where I think they ought to be made. Here is a case where the law fixes the salary of the clerk of the supreme court of the District of Columbia at \$5,000 a year, and I assume, from the reading of the statute, that the clerk must collect that much in the way of fees from his office in order to get the salary. If he collects more than that—more than enough to pay the expenses of his office—the money goes into the Treasury.

The District Code was prepared by a commission of distinguished lawyers of the District of Columbia. The clerk of the supreme court was purposely omitted from the list of officers to whom the District of Columbia in litigation should not pay fees, and the Congress of the United States approved the work of that commission. The office of the clerk of the supreme court is a very responsible one. Large trust funds are often in the custody of that officer. The salary of \$5,000 is not out of the way. It is fixed by law, and inasmuch as this salary was fixed and the scheme of collecting fees was recommended by the commission and adopted by Congress, I do not see any reason why the Committee on Appropriations should undertake to legislate and to correct what it deems to be inequalities. There ought to be hearings before the committee that handles legislation of that importance. The officer himself ought to have the right to come before the committee and explain the reason for the law and the necessity for its continuation. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I shall have to insist on my point of order.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, would it interfere with the gentleman if I make one suggestion at this time?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Not at all.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The gentleman will remember that, as a matter of fact, the code was passed practically without discussion on the statement of the gentleman in charge of it that it did not change existing law, and was simply a codification of existing law. Now, the fact is that in this instance it did change existing law, and that is exactly why the committee has felt that the law which was intended to be passed by the House and by Congress should be restored to the condition in which it was before the code was passed.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I can not permit that statement to go unchallenged, that the committee reporting the bill for the code stated that it did not change existing law. Why, Mr. Chairman, that was the purpose of the code, to change existing law, and it did in practically all instances. That was the object in passing the code. If we did not want to change existing law there would be no necessity for passing it.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Was the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BABCOCK] in charge of the bill?

Mr. BABCOCK. Yes.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Then, on the statement of the gentleman from Wisconsin, I withdraw my statement. I spoke from recollection that the purpose of it was that indicated by the word "code," that it was a codification of existing law.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. This code was prepared by a commission composed of able and distinguished lawyers in the District of Columbia, who practiced at the bar of this court.

Mr. BABCOCK. It was prepared originally by the judges on the bench in the District, who afterwards submitted it to the bar association and then to a subcommittee of the District of Columbia, which officially reported the code.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I shall insist on my point of order.

Mr. BABCOCK. Just a moment; I do not want to be misunderstood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Indiana be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BABCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I made the statement that I was in charge of the bill. That is an error. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JENKINS], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, was actually in charge of the bill on the floor of the House.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana makes the point of order against the paragraph on page 55, beginning with line 16 and ending with line 21, that it changes existing law. The Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Court-house, District of Columbia: For the following force necessary for the care and protection of the court-house in the District of Columbia, under the direction of the United States marshal of the District of Columbia: Engineer, \$1,200; three watchmen, at \$720 each; three firemen, at \$720 each; five laborers, at \$480 each; and seven assistant messengers, at \$720 each; in all, \$12,960, to be expended under the direction of the Attorney-General.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question or two of the gentleman in charge of the bill. This court-house is what is known as the "District building," the old building where the recorder of deeds has his office, on Judiciary Square?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. It is the court-house on Judiciary Square, yes, sir.

Mr. COWHERD. I would like to ask the gentleman what are the duties performed by the seven assistant messengers at \$720 a year?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, they are messengers performing the usual messenger service for the marshal's office and for the other offices within the building.

Mr. COWHERD. But there are deputy marshals in charge of the courts as bailiffs, and everything of that kind?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. This is messenger service, as I understand.

Mr. COWHERD. I can not understand, and I am asking the gentleman simply for information. This is an appropriation "for the following force for the care and protection of the court-house in the District of Columbia," and here are nineteen men on that roll for the care and protection of that one court-house, not a very large building at that. I can not imagine what duties these assistant messengers perform. If they are not bailiffs, if they are not deputy marshals, if they do not wait on the courts, as I take it they do not, as all that seems to be provided for, what duties do they perform?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that many years ago all of these employees were paid out of a general fund, "for miscellaneous expenses of the United States court."

In accordance with the policy of showing on the face of the bill, so far as possible, all employments, these men were placed upon the regular roll many years ago; and, while I have not given them special attention because they came in that way so long ago, my understanding is that they are employed for the usual messenger service about the building containing many officers, just as we have many messengers around the House of Representatives.

Of course it is impracticable in the preparation of an appropriation bill to inquire into, and it would be impossible to keep in mind for answer upon call, all the duties of all these minor employments. The committee has too many large questions to solve to be able to attend to such small things. In the nature of the case, the committee must in such matters rely largely on the officers in charge of the general division of service. In this instance the committee has followed the recommendations of the Attorney-General of the United States.

Mr. COWHERD. These are assistant messengers; are there a like number of principal messengers? These seem to be assistant messengers; how many messengers are there whom these assist?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. There are none provided in this bill.

Mr. COWHERD. These are designated as seven assistant messengers.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. That title, Mr. Chairman, is in harmony with the rate of pay. Seven hundred and twenty dollars is supposed to be the rate of pay for an assistant messenger. I am not advised that there are any messengers whom these assist. I think that title is wholly determined by the rate of pay—\$720.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, on page 57, in lines 3 and 4, the words "and seven assistant messengers at \$720 each" and change the total in lines 4 and 5 to \$7,920 instead of \$12,960.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 3 and 4, page 57, strike out the words "and seven assistant messengers at \$720 each." Also change the total from \$12,960 to \$7,920.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, all I care to say about it is that my friend has made the motion, and he has placed his judgment against that of those who are in charge of these employees, against that of the Attorney-General. That is all I care to say. It is for the committee to say whether they approve the judgment of the gentleman from Missouri or those who have charge of the work.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee has heard the gentleman's explanation of the necessity of these men carried in this bill and likewise his defense of the motion, for if they have I am quite certain that they will recognize, as they must, that the burden is upon the gentlemen who bring the bill in here, taking money out of the Treasury of the United States to pay the men mentioned in it—that the burden is upon them to show the necessity for it, and the committee certainly will find that they have not borne that burden in the gentleman's remarks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, here are nineteen men carried in this item at an expense of \$12,960. How many deputy marshals there may be in charge of the courts we do not know, but I submit to this committee that we have reason to believe that, legislating as we usually do on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, they are ample. How many bailiffs there are to take care of the courts we do not know, but we likewise have the right to presume that the force is ample.

Now, there is an engineer and three watchmen and three firemen and five laborers, and how many janitors there are we do not know. In addition to that, there are seven assistant messengers. What their work is the gentleman seems to be utterly unable to show to this committee. Mr. Chairman, a gentleman has just told me that there are six men guarding one of the portals to this Chamber. I do not know whether they are all stationed there on salary or not, but I have it from the gentleman from Texas here [Mr. BURLESON] that he was informed yesterday that at one of the entrances six men were stationed, and the gentleman from Minnesota says that these assistant messengers are needed just like we need our messengers. Well, if that is the way we supply messengers for ourselves I submit at least we ought not to adopt that as the standard by which we measure the needs of others, and I therefore think, unless the gentleman can give a better explanation, that the amendment ought to be adopted.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this is in accordance with an estimate made by the Attorney-General of the United States. This building contains the court of appeals, all the nisi prius courts, the office of the register of deeds, and a great many other offices. It is a large building, with, as I say, many officers housed in it. The force named in the bill is, I understand, the entire force employed. There are no "messengers," as I understand.

Mr. COWHERD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. COWHERD. Does the gentleman know of any building in the State from which the gentleman comes where the nisi prius courts have messengers or assistant messengers?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. These are not messengers to the courts; they are the people who take care of the building and serve as messengers.

Mr. COWHERD. They are not janitors; the gentleman does not mean that they are janitors?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. They do some janitor work.

Mr. COWHERD. You have a force of janitors which takes charge of the building and you have five laborers besides.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COWHERD].

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 56, nays 45.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chairman appointed Mr. COWHERD and Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 77, nays 74.

Accordingly the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHARITIES AND CORRECTIONS.

Board of Charities: For secretary, \$3,000; clerk, \$1,000; stenographer, \$900; messenger, \$600; four inspectors, at \$720 each; traveling expenses, \$400; four drivers, at \$600 each; in all, \$11,180.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question in reference to the paragraph headed "Charities and corrections," on page 57 of the bill. In this paragraph, Mr. Chairman, we find that there are four inspectors at \$720 each. These inspectors, I assume, are men whose office it is and who are directed to investigate applications for relief. They are men whose duty it is to go out into the poorer districts of the city, where of course applicants for relief obviously come from, and discover whether the application is meritorious or not.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] is correct, except that there are two men and two women employed in this work.

Mr. BAKER. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee whether he considers that it requires a lower order of mentality and a lower character of man for that work than is required for inspectors which are provided for and which have been voted for, on page 12, for the street-sweeping department, where we are told that six inspectors are to receive \$1,200 each? In other words, I wish to know whether the subcommittee on the District of Columbia regard the investigation by these men as of less importance and requiring a far lower grade of men than the investigation of garbage, whether the human derelicts should be investigated by a low grade of men and the garbage of the city be investigated by a high grade of men.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. By way of a general answer, Mr. Chairman, I would say that we have made no changes in the salaries in this bill, except in the case of the kindergartners, who are receiving the lowest pay, and that was simply a change in the estimate. Now, we do not pretend that in every instance in this bill the emolument and compensation are ideally best. Under the existing circumstances, with the larger problems that we have to contend with, we do not like to open up this question of changes of salaries. We have just completed a great plant for the supply of water, the last appropriation being over sixteen hundred thousand dollars. We are this year completing the general trunk sewage disposal system, involving an expenditure of about one million of dollars. Until these great enterprises are taken out of the way we have felt a reluctance in taking up the question of adjusting salaries, which is a large question by itself, and which probably involves an increase of expenditure which the present condition of the finances of the District of Columbia will not permit us to make. And all that we can say is that in due season we hope to take up this general question of an adjustment of salaries, and hope, so far as our limitation of knowledge may permit, to do something toward making them more equitable. No one realizes more than the gentlemen composing the committee that many of these salaries are entirely inadequate, and I will say that two of the salaries that we thought of changing, if we changed any, are the very ones that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] has now directed attention to.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman allow me a question? The salaries of the inspectors—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND]?

Mr. BAKER. Certainly.

Mr. LIND. The salaries of the inspectors provided for on page 12, the garbage inspectors, were never fixed by law before, were they? I think you stated, when that paragraph was under consideration, that they had been paid out of the lump appropriation.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in those cases where we have revealed to the House what the salaries are that have heretofore been paid out of the general appropriation, unseen to the House and unseen to the committee, we have adjusted these salaries in proportion to the per diem. For instance, a person heretofore employed had been receiving a certain amount, we simply reduce the sum. Thus, if the per

diem amounted to \$547.50, we have made it \$540. If the per diem amounted to \$1,287.50, we have made it \$1,200, and so on, and we have so adjusted it that people receiving smaller salaries shall have a less diminution, and those receiving a larger salary should suffer a larger reduction. We have simply assigned to each person that may have been upon the roll a sum smaller than the amount that he has already been receiving under the per diem plan, we feeling that, all things considered, that we did not have time to go through all this and to attempt to carry out a policy of adjustment on the basis of equity. We assume that the Commissioners, who are men of high character, have been doing what they deemed was but fair and right as to the per diem emoluments, and we have followed that, and whatever discrepancy arises comes out of that situation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LIND. I move to strike out the two last words.

Mr. BAKER. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, the indulgence of the House in this matter; that I be allowed to speak for ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that he may be allowed to speak for ten minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota would probably like to ask his question now.

Mr. LIND. I wanted to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill—

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Did some one object?

Mr. LIND. No; I am proceeding with the consent of the gentleman from New York. I want to ask how it is that the salaries, generally speaking, are lower for skilled, trained, educated men in this bill than they are for men without qualifications of that character? Now, for instance, take the inspectors provided for at \$720 under the board of corrections and charities. On page 51 you provide for a number of food inspectors at \$1,000, and they are required to be veterinary surgeons, trained, educated, skilled men, presumably. But in fixing the salaries for garbage inspectors, and a liberal number of them, and inspectors of street sweeping, you readily grant them from two to five hundred dollars more. Now, I would like to have an explanation of the principles and the logic that guides the committee to such a course of discrimination against talent, learning, and training. Especially is this evident in the pay of the teachers.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Why, Mr. Chairman, I have already explained that the committee recognizes that there are certain inequities in relation to these salaries, and it proposes to take this question up when the larger questions have been solved. And the gentleman's statement is not quite fair. Now, these men and women who make these inspections might have much or little to do. It is not a severe task. Probably the thing that is required is a kindly heart, so that those who may be suffering shall not be allowed to continue to suffer without relief or may not be allowed to suffer improperly, so that little judgment is needed. It does not require that the person shall be strong in body, nor does it require their constant employment. There may be many days when they have nothing to do. Now, with reference to the street-sweeping force: They are employed for long hours and have to be watchful. They also have to be active and able-bodied. Therefore, when we come to an adjustment, it is quite probable that they will be paid higher salaries than these particular persons even then. I just simply enter a general disclaimer of the gentleman's statement that talent is discriminated against.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman permit me to call his attention to line 9, page 51:

Four sanitary and food inspectors, who shall be veterinary surgeons, at \$1,000 each.

Now, these men certainly will be employed all their time if they do their duty. They are appointed at \$1,000 each. The garbage inspectors, without any qualifications of study or training, are employed at \$1,200 each. That is what I can not understand.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I repeat that many of these salaries are going to be revised when we have concluded our consideration of these larger things.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I may or may not be able to throw a little light upon this subject, but I hope I can for the benefit of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND]. All this talk, I may say, is a continuation in part of the discussion which took place yesterday and shows the danger line we were on. There has been appropriated for street

sweeping and garbage collection, in round numbers, \$300,000. The employees have been paid out of a lump sum; the salaries have been fixed, not by the Committee on Appropriations, but wholly within the judgment of the District Commissioners. These men have been on the pay roll as per diem employees. The salary in every case, I think, which has been received by a per diem employee has been in excess of what that employee will now receive on the annual roll; and I want to say that hitherto these salaries have been beyond the reach of the Committee on Appropriations or anybody else, save in this case the Commissioners.

Mr. LIND. How is it possible that any appointee of this Government, paid from money that we appropriate, is beyond our reach?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. In this, that we gave for street sweeping, we will say, \$200,000. The persons employed in doing that work were paid by the day, largely, out of the lump sum under the control of the District Commissioners; and the same is true in regard to garbage.

Mr. LIND. Could you not have limited the disposal of that money, limited the per diem, when the appropriation was made?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I think I am not making myself clear to the gentleman. We turned over a lump sum. When I say "we" I mean the Congress.

Mr. LIND. Was that incumbent upon the committee or the Congress unless it chose to do so?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Wisely or unwisely, this has been the method for years. It has stood there Congress after Congress, and not until this session (although it has been in contemplation a session or two before) has it been determined to correct what the Committee on Appropriations believe to be a wrong system; and now the purpose is to bring within the purview of the committee all of these salaried men; in other words, to put them on the annual roll and, by so doing, fixing their salaries.

Mr. LIND. But why should you fix the annual salary of an inspector of garbage, vegetable refuse, and mineral refuse at a higher amount than the salary of the inspector of food, who is required to be an educated, trained person, holding a diploma from a reputable institution?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. These men have been in the employ of the Government at that salary for years. The other men have been drawing, under a per diem system, out of a lump sum. Now, if this recommendation of the committee is adopted, it puts these men where you and others can fix their salaries. We have done the best we could this year. We can not fly in the face of the Commissioners and say: "Here, we know much more about this than you do." We have cut them down, and it may be we will reduce them again.

Mr. LIND. Now, let me ask the gentleman another question. On yesterday the committee made the point of order against a proposition to increase the salaries of teachers receiving \$500 a year—some a little more and some less. This same bill carries a salary of \$1,500 for a dog catcher. How do you justify such discrimination? That is what I should like to know.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if I have not been able to make myself clear to the gentleman, I fear I shall be utterly unable to do so. We are to-day striking at the very thing the gentleman wanted to do yesterday in trying to turn over a million dollars to be used at the discriminating will of a few men. Now, the gentleman is coming in here and attacking the committee because we are trying to avoid the very error that on yesterday he would have us run into by endeavoring to persuade us to turn over another lump sum to another body of men to be used in their discretion, when these men whom we are now considering have, according to the judgment of the gentleman, used that discretion unwisely. The committee are seeking to correct that, as was stated yesterday by myself and others on the floor, having this very thing in mind.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Is it to promote correct procedure that the committee maintains the different rates of compensation which the gentleman from Minnesota has just mentioned—the salary of \$1,500 to the dog catcher and of \$500 to the school-teacher? [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman from New York that the pay had been fixed out of a lump sum which the gentleman from New York was advocating yesterday. The committee has put that on the roll at less than you had been paying constantly under another system, and it may be still materially reduced with others at a later date, but we

did not feel in making the change—not in one, but in hundreds—that we could fly in the face of these men who came and pledged their judgment that these were proper estimates.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Then I understand the gentleman to say that because certain persons on this side of the House advocated the giving of a lump sum to the board of education, as the only way, under the ruling of the Chair, by which salaries of teachers could be raised, therefore the difference in compensation between dog catchers and school-teachers pointed out by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] is vindicated and made satisfactory. [Laughter.]

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I am trying to interpret the gentleman's language, so that we can all understand his meaning.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman from New York that the advocacy of that proposition was not wholly from his side—

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I desire to modify my language in that respect and to acknowledge with great satisfaction the entire correctness of what the gentleman now says.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I am simply arguing for consistency, that the position taken yesterday led to this abuse, and that is not a wise thing to turn over a lump sum of money, large or small, to be used in the discrimination of men who are not accountable to this body for the disposition of these funds.

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I must still ask the gentleman how that explains the difference in compensation fixed by the committee for dog catchers and school-teachers? Does the gentleman hold that the difference in the value of these respective services justifies the difference in their salaries?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. If the gentleman from Michigan will pardon me, I would like to have the gentleman from New York or the gentleman from Minnesota show where he finds authority for saying that a dog catcher gets \$1,500?

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. I took the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LIND. Well, the bill uses the euphonious term of "pound master," and in our State, as my colleague well knows, we call the pound master "dog catcher." I spoke as a Minnesotan. [Laughter.]

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The pound master is not simply a dog catcher. He is a man in charge of public property.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What does he impound?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Why, he impounds stray animals.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Dogs?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Dogs and other animals. He has charge of the pound.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. He is pound master, and has charge of the pound and impounds stray animals?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Is there anybody who catches them?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Yes.

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent of the House to amend my remarks and substitute the term "dog keeper" instead of "dog catcher" wherever I have used the latter term.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. The gentleman is trying to be facetious. The gentleman ought to know that dogs are not the only animals that are impounded. He will be fair enough to acknowledge that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What other animals are there that are impounded? Are there any hogs or cattle astray?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Why, certainly; he impounds all animals that are found astray—horses, mules, and occasionally cattle.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I understood the Chair to say that the time of the gentleman from Michigan had expired. The time belonged to me, and it is all gone. [Laughter.]

Mr. COCKRAN of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make the same correction that was made by the gentleman from Minnesota, except in this respect, that everything I said about the relative pay or compensation of dog catchers and school-teachers I wish to repeat and emphasize with reference to the salaries of pound masters and those of school-teachers. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALLEN). The Chair thinks that can be done without formal action of the committee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the time that was granted to me a few moments ago has been exhausted?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to conclude his remarks. He was taken off his feet by other gentlemen, and I therefore ask that he be allowed to conclude his remarks on the subject. His time was exhausted by them.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York have time to conclude his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I was very glad to yield to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] to develop the matter of the relative salaries paid to various inspectors in the different departments of the municipal government of Washington, because, Mr. Chairman, that phase of the matter does not seriously appeal to me. In saying that, I do not wish to belittle what my friend [Mr. LIND] has said on the subject, as I fully agree with him, but I mean that that aspect does not appeal to me because of the far greater question which is involved in this appropriation, in the same sense, Mr. Chairman, that the matter of a loss of one life in a steamboat or railroad accident will not appeal to this House in the same way that the murder of a thousand lives did in the massacre which took place in St. Petersburg two days ago. In that sense of relationship I am not seriously interested in the matter of the relative salaries paid to these different inspectors.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire, the House having exceeded my most sanguine expectations in granting me unlimited time to discuss this subject, to say a few words on the particular question of why it comes that in the twentieth century it is necessary for the House of Representatives to incorporate in an appropriation bill some hundreds of thousands of dollars for the relief of the indigent.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT ON THE SLUMS.

The House will remember that in the message which the President of the United States sent here on the 9th day of December last he called particular attention to the deplorable conditions existing here in Washington. I admit that he did not in the slightest degree hint at the cause of those conditions, but he did emphasize their existence.

Now, for every effect there is a cause. As the President calls attention to in his message, and as I called attention to on the floor of this House on April 18, 1904, some ten months before, if there are thousands and thousands of children who die in this city before they are 1 year old there is a cause for that awful loss of life. We are told that 475 human infants die in the slums of the city of Washington out of every 1,000 that are born. The President says that—

The farmers, the mechanics, the skilled and unskilled laborers, the small shopkeepers, make up the bulk of the population of any country; and upon their well-being, generation after generation, the well-being of the country and the race depends.

Mr. Chairman, how comes it that in spite of the tremendous advances that have been made in the United States, greater than in any other place in the world, that after one hundred and thirty years of the existence of the Republic it becomes necessary for this House of Representatives to annually appropriate hundreds of thousands of dollars for the destitute, to provide for those who have not even a crust of bread to keep their bodies together from day to day? How comes it? The President, in his message, goes on to say that—

Rapid development in wealth and industrial leadership is a good thing, but only if it goes hand in hand with improvement, and not deterioration, physical and moral.

PAUPERS A MODERN PRODUCT.

Now, Mr. Chairman, two or three decades ago what we have come to call "paupers" were practically unknown anywhere in the United States. It was a rare occurrence for any large number of men to be out of employment in this country, even at the time of the civil war. Why this change? That is the question that this House ought to direct its attention to, because we are the municipal government of the city of Washington. How comes it that here, right in the nation's capital, in the city which we govern, where citizenship does not exist, in which the inhabitants have no voice and therefore can not be held responsible—how comes it that here, where our power is absolute, this fearful condition of affairs exists?

PHYSICAL AND MORAL DETERIORATION.

There is deterioration, as the President says, "physical and moral," and there must be a very general deterioration where such a condition as I have referred to exists. That deterioration must be very prevalent in such a condition as that which I have cited, of nearly 500 babies dying during the year of their

birth, when nearly one-half of the children born in the slums of the District die the first year. The President says further:

The death-rate statistics show a terrible increase in mortality, and especially in infant mortality, in overcrowded tenements.

And that—

The poorest families in tenement houses live in one room.

Think of it; think of it, Mr. Chairman, in these days of "progress," in these days of so-called "civilization," in these boasted "prosperous" days families are living in one room here in the nation's capital, here where we are providing for the expenditure every year of seven to eight hundred million dollars of the people's wealth, there are families living in one room. Can there be anything else but physical and moral deterioration among people thus placed? How can they lead healthy lives, how can they lead moral lives, under such a condition of affairs as that? He says that—

The average death rate of the one-room house is about twice what it is in the two-room house and four times what it is in the three-room tenement.

Now, Mr. Chairman, is it not about time that this House, the municipal government of Washington, should address itself to the question of why it is that in this city there are thousands of families living in one room to the family? Is that a matter of no importance? Is the fact that the United States has got seventy or eighty billion dollars' worth of wealth the only thing that we care about? Do we care nothing about the physical and moral deterioration of the people? Are we responsible? That is the question. Can there be any pretense that we are not responsible? The President says that—

The slum exacts a heavy total of death from those who dwell therein; and this is the case not merely in the great crowded slums of high buildings in New York and Chicago, but in the alley slums of Washington.

But, he says:

The problems incident to our highly complex modern industrial civilization, with its manifold and perplexing tendencies both for good and for evil, are far less sharply accentuated in the city of Washington than in most other cities.

Mr. Chairman, if that is correct, if it is true that here in the city of Washington conditions are less onerous for the poor, that the physical and the moral deterioration of the people is less accentuated than in other great cities, then what does it mean? Is it not a terrific arraignment by the nation's Chief of the policies now obtaining in the nation, and which have not been materially changed in forty years? It means, necessarily and obviously, that in other great hives of population there are even more people, more families living in one-room houses, more social, moral, and physical deterioration going on.

WHAT IS THE CAUSE?

What is the cause of it, Mr. Chairman? I have tried to call the attention of this House two or three times this week, while this bill has been under consideration, to these facts, but my voice has been like the voice of one crying in the wilderness. I am sorry to say that I have been unable, practically, to get any attention paid to the cause of this fearful condition of affairs. I have endeavored several times to call the attention of this House to the fact that a primary cause of this condition is to be found in the action of the Commissioners of the District—the city of Washington—who permit the assessors to deliberately and flagrantly violate the law which requires the assessment of property at its true value, placing as they do upon the assessment roll land as low as 4, 5, and 6 per cent of its true value, thereby creating this fearful condition, creating this deplorable condition, which compels thousands of families to live in one room because rents are high and they can not get for their labor sufficient recompense to enable them even to live in a two-room apartment.

The chairman of the subcommittee the other day, on Monday, in response to my question as to the aggregate assessments of the city of Washington said that they were approximately \$200,000,000. That includes not merely the value of all the land, but the value of improvements of every kind and the value of so much personal property of the people of this city as is put upon the assessment roll.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the mere statement that in a city of over 300,000 population, with the great wealth that is flaunted here, that there is less than \$800 of all kinds of property upon the assessment roll per capita is a condemnation of the assessment without regard to anything else.

TOM L. JOHNSON REPORT.

But I call your attention here again to-day to this report of the "Tom L. Johnson" committee, made to this House on May 24, 1892, showing as the result of a full and most exhaustive

investigation, lasting several weeks and embracing a report covering 156 pages, made by a subcommittee of this House, that even at that time, when the population of the city of Washington was probably not much more than half what it is to-day, certainly not more than two-thirds, that even then (1892) the land values of this city were over \$400,000,000, or twice as much as the aggregate "assessment" of all the property in this city at the present time.

But Mr. Johnson's report says, and he shows it upon the evidence of real estate experts in the city whose statements never have been seriously challenged and never will be seriously questioned, that at that time the land values were increasing at the rate of \$40,000,000 a year, and with the increase of population, with the increase of wealth, with the vast improvements that have been made in transportation and exchange, with all the things that make up what we call civilization, that increase of land values unquestionably is at a greater annual ratio to-day than it was twelve years ago. There must therefore be approximately a billion dollars of land values here in the city of Washington.

A BILLION-DOLLAR FUND.

A billion dollars of land values! And yet the assessors, to whom we pay thirty-five hundred dollars a year to assess this and other property, who take an oath to abide by the law directing that they put all property upon the assessment roll at its true value, can only discover about one-tenth of the land values of the city.

One of the leading Members of this House, after I had made the reference to these enormous land values the other day, came to me and said that he did not believe that such land values existed; that experts had come before some committee of which he was a member and said that there were no such land values in the city of Washington; that nowhere was land worth more than about \$20 a square foot. Everybody knows that an increase of population results in an increase of relative land values; that in all communities, but especially at their centers, land values are increasing at a far greater ratio than the population. Even twelve years ago it was shown that sites here in the city of Washington were worth \$75 a square foot. Those sites are probably worth to-day not less than \$100 a square foot—probably five times what the gentleman regards as the most valuable site in the city of Washington.

Mr. Chairman, because it has a direct bearing upon this question, and not because I wish to trespass unduly upon the time of the House, I am going to ask the Clerk to read a little pamphlet which ought to give an indication to this House of the causes that produce the deplorable condition to which the President referred in his message a month ago. That little brochure is a product of the brain of the son of one whom every man in the United States venerates to-day, William Lloyd Garrison. He is a worthy son of a great father. He has devoted his life to the same cause to which the original William Lloyd Garrison devoted his.

With a broader view, with a deeper comprehension of the causes that create these unequal social conditions, of the causes which bring this fearful increase of poverty amidst advancing wealth, he is devoting himself to the cause to which his father devoted his life. He is devoting himself, as his father did, to the uplifting of humanity by showing that the fundamental cause of poverty in Washington, as elsewhere in the civilized world, is the private appropriation of ground rent. I ask that it be read, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] asks unanimous consent for the reading of an article which he sends to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, pardon me, as it is to come out of my time, I merely ask that it be read by the Clerk so that the whole House may hear and understand it.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROTECTIVE TARIFFS AND BLIZZARDS.

[By William Lloyd Garrison.]

A cyclone or blizzard has many of the attributes of a protective tariff. It is a barrier to the free interchange of commodities. It produces scarcity and enhances prices. It profits a few at the expense of the many. It is a benefit to the dealer in milk or coal or meat or other necessities of daily use, provided he is caught with a good stock on hand. The cab company does not grieve over the troubles of the street railway company. It has all it can do to gather in the harvest which enforced custom has so suddenly created. No, not created. Taxes and storms are not creators, but destroyers. Let me amend my sentence by saying to gather in the harvest that the street railway was prevented by accident from gathering itself.

This recent snowstorm tariff raised the wages in some employments. The snow shovelers on one railroad found it easy to exact \$2 an hour for their services, where they ordinarily got 12½ cents. The New York hackmen were able to make their patrons pay from ten to fifty dollars

for a single service. The livery-stable men appreciated the benefit of protection, which, alas, the poor horses did not, any more than the customers. The linemen on the telegraph routes were much in request, and employment overtook even the tramps who ordinarily flee from it. Looked at from the point of view of these prospering people, the storm embargo was a benefit. The hotel keepers of New York who found customers for their rooms at \$50 a night, all had a good word to say of the blizzard. Sidney Smith knew of a man who would speak disrespectfully of the equator, although, if that imaginary line had conferred a pecuniary benefit upon him, his language would have been deferential.

Supposing if, instead of a few days' isolation, a much longer period of nonintercourse with adjoining towns and cities should occur. What more natural thing than the conviction, of the parties who find it gainful, that, after all, a blizzard is a blessing? And if the weather could be controlled by the votes of a community, who doubts that we should have plausible arguments to prove that storms benefit trade? The landlord of the Fifth Avenue hotel might borrow the argument of the treasurer of some big woolen mill, and say, "If I do get large prices for my rooms, see how many more servants I can employ, how much more food I can buy of the marketmen, thereby helping them, and how many more dollars my employees will have to spend, thus increasing the general trade of the community. Don't you see? What benefits me must benefit all." And the other favored industries would echo the theory, and by and by public sentiment might worship a storm for the sake of a storm, just as we hear people crying for protection for the sake of protection.

Fortunately, we can not run the weather by ballots or lobbies, and in a few days the railroads and the ferryboats and the telegraph wires are all working again, and humanity rejoices that the embargo is broken and that free trade once more pours in its bounty to the great city, bringing the milk to pining babies, the coal to freezing families, the meat and vegetables to hungry mouths, even though the landlords, the hack drivers, and the snow shovelers lose their monopoly. A tariff is a railroad interruption, a suspension of shipping, a derangement of the natural laws of supply and demand, which, left to themselves, bring constantly and unerringly the needed commodities and avoid the gluts and overstocks which result from artificial attempts at regulation.

Unhindered communication between nations brings the same blessings that come from interdependence and free exchange of neighboring communities, because economic laws are universal and, while governments and peoples vary, are themselves as fixed and immutable as the laws that govern the movement of the heavenly bodies. The kinship and neighborliness of England was shown by the kind service she rendered us that week. Boston had no communication with New York, but London kindly steps in and facilitates the message between the two cities, which otherwise would have been impossible. That is a case where brother man is appreciated, and his brotherhood is just as helpful whether he lives in England or New York. In fact, it was his very distance this time that proved his nearness.

BOSTON, MASS., March, 1888.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I would not have inflicted this little document upon the House at this time were it not that it has a peculiar significance to-day. A great storm is traversing the United States. This storm will do just what protective tariffs do—interfere with the natural order of things, prevent the natural exchange of products. Because this storm bids fair to rival the blizzard of 1888—the most complete exemplification of the benefits of "protection" for decades—it ought to be worshiped by every man who believes in a protective tariff. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

"BLIZZARDS" AND "PROTECTION."

A blizzard is simply nature's interference with the natural laws, while the protective tariff is a legislative interference with the natural law, you gentlemen upon the other side of the House having accomplished the same end through the statute books. Because you have done that, and because you have passed other laws which interfere with the law of production and exchange, we have here in the city of Washington, as elsewhere all over the United States wherever large populations are congregated, this fearful exhibition of fabulous wealth and abject poverty, and the greater the population the most startling the disparity.

On the one hand you have the multimillionaire, the product of your social system, the product of your interference with natural laws, and on the other hand, hundreds of thousands, aye, millions of individuals who are on the verge of starvation, also the inevitable result of your interference with natural laws. You can not create a millionaire without creating a pauper.

Mr. Chairman, I thought I could have provoked one response at least from the defenders of that system; but although there are some forty Republican Members present, many of them leading expounders of this doctrine of interference with natural law, not one of them feels called upon to defend it from this attack of Mr. Garrison's briefly explained by me. And yet, Mr. Chairman, this little brochure by William Lloyd Garrison shows the cause of the existence of the tenement houses in Washington, the cause of the existence of tenement houses in New York, and the existence in every large community of thousands who are compelled to make obeisance to their fellow-men, and ask, aye beg, the privilege of exerting their labor in order to get bread for their bodies.

Notwithstanding that this document which I have had read to the House exposes the hollowness of the fraud of "protec-

tion," not one Member on the Republican side dares come to the defense of this system, his system of interference with natural laws, his system which interferes with the law of production and exchange. Not one, I say, of its defenders dares to get up on that side.

CONFESSION AND AVOIDANCE.

Mr. Chairman, silence is equivalent to the lawyer's plea of "confession and avoidance." Can I not provoke one man to say something here to-day upon this floor in defense of interference with natural law? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if I must proceed it is because I conclude that some response will yet be made from the other side. I am compelled to trespass further upon this House under the indulgence of unlimited time granted me to ask that some one rise and give some reason, give some excuse to this House for this interference with the natural order and deny the relation of cause and effect which I here assert exists between protective tariffs; between the granting of special privileges to railroads; between granting special privileges to street-car, to electric-light, telephone, telegraph, and water companies—all of them being a denial of equal rights—and the existence of widespread poverty.

I do hope some gentleman will rise upon this floor and deny my assertion that these things, these special privileges, are the cause of this deplorable condition of affairs, which even the President of the United States felt it his duty, in his message to Congress on the 6th of December last, to call to your attention. Not one man belonging to the party of the Republican President has said one word on this floor on this subject; no bills to remedy these conditions have been introduced, nor does one man rise here now to-day in defense of the system which, I assert, and which every man who has investigated the subject must agree, has brought about this fearful condition of affairs.

Silence! [Laughter.] Silence is the only answer. Mr. Chairman, if I trespass further upon the indulgence of the House, it is entirely due to the fact that I assume the House desires to hear me. And even if the Republican Members who are present have not yet felt impelled to come to the defense of their system of interference with the natural law, I must believe that there is germinating in their minds some reason that suddenly—soon, I hope—will blossom out in all its fullness that will convince the House and the country that interference with natural law is the proper thing to do. [Laughter and applause.]

BLIZZARDS THE MOST EFFECTIVE "PROTECTION."

Now, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Garrison says that "a cyclone or a blizzard has many of the attributes of a protective tariff." Yes; it is even more effective temporarily than a protective tariff; because men (and women) smuggle under a protective tariff, as you offer a great premium to perjury in the great difference in price between the "protected" and the smuggled goods. You induce people to be perjurers. You induce men to lie and to perjure themselves when bringing goods into the country, when they are doing that which they have a perfectly natural right to do, and which you have no natural or moral right to prevent their doing. No protective tariff ever can be erected or ever will be erected which will be completely efficacious in keeping out foreign goods, I care not what the rate of duty may be; but when a great city experiences, as the city of New York and many other large communities did in 1888, a blizzard even more severe than that now raging outside this Chamber, which completely ties up all means of transportation and exchange, there you have the protective system in its ultimate, there you have it in its fullness, there you have it in all its beauty; because there is then no getting over the artificial wall, no digging under by trenching or smuggling.

Why does not the Republican party, believing in a protective tariff, in the so-called "protective principle"—to apply the word "principle" to larceny is ridiculous—but why does not the Republican party call upon the clerk of the weather, why does it not give him a larger salary, in order that he may throw around the United States a wall of snow a thousand feet high, so that no products can come into the United States to lower the "high" wages of the American workingman nor lessen the profits of American monopolists? Why does not the Republican party do that?

I do hope, Mr. Chairman, that I will be able to provoke some defense of that "principle." I am not to blame if I go on. The Republican party is called upon to-day to defend itself. The elements and "protection" are in unison to-day. Why does it not do it? Here in this brief little document which I hold in my hand, which the Clerk has just read, is epitomized the cause of the conditions to which I have referred.

HOW TO LIBERATE MANKIND.

Here with unerring accuracy the son of the great American liberator points the way to the liberation, not merely of the people of the United States, but the liberation of mankind throughout the world. With unerring accuracy, with extraordinary simplicity and harmony in expression, he shows you the interference by nature with the desire of men in this country and in other countries to communicate with each other, to exchange the surplus of their products with each other, to be social beings—he shows you that when nature comes and interferes with that natural desire she creates a condition which is the exact counterpart of a complete protective tariff.

And yet there is not a devotee of that system on this floor—there is not a devotee of that system anywhere—who will say that a blizzard is a good thing. Why is it not a good thing to protect the people who are constituents of my colleague from New York [Mr. DWIGHT] over there from the people of the State of Pennsylvania? Why is it not a good thing for nature to erect a wall to prevent the exchange of products between the constituents of my friend from New York [General KETCHAM] and the constituents of my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL]? Why is it not a good thing for nature to do that?

TUNNELS, BRIDGES, RAILROADS ANNIHILATE "PROTECTION."

Why does man, foolish, stupid man, go and drive a Simplon or a St. Gothard tunnel under the Alps? Why does he interfere with the natural obstruction to the exchange of products of which the Alps are typical natural creations? Why do you go and build railroads from one side of the United States to the other? Why do you facilitate the means by which individuals may be transported from one community to another, and by which the products of those individuals can be exchanged and sent from one end of the country to the other?

Do you not know that that is an interference with nature? Do you not know that nature itself has provided the very best form of protective tariff in the Allegheny Mountains? Do you not know that when you build a bridge across the Mississippi River you interfere with nature, which put the Mississippi River there to prevent the people of the East from exchanging their products with the people of the West? Why do you interfere with the natural law? If you believe in protection, if protection is the natural law, why do you build a railroad, why do you build a bridge, why do you tunnel a mountain? Oh, you say, it facilitates exchange, it facilitates the transportation of persons and property, individuals in one part of the country are anxious to communicate and exchange their products with each other and with people in other parts of the world. But that is not adhering to the protective system, which is an interference with the natural order, that of men desiring to exchange their products one with the other.

Mr. Chairman, I stand aghast at this indifference of the Republican party to the charges which I have reiterated here today during the past half hour that "protection" and other legislative interference with nature's laws has produced these deplorable social conditions. Not one, not even my venerable friend from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], who has just entered the Chamber, feels it necessary to raise his voice upon this floor today in defense of your system of "protection." Is there nothing I can do to provoke a reply, Mr. Chairman? Will not the Chair suggest some means by which I can provoke a response, a defense to these charges? The Chair at this moment is not a protectionist. The present occupant of the chair [Mr. MANN] is for the present the presiding genius of this committee, and, as such, temporarily a nonpartisan; surely his brain can suggest some means by which it can be done.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Minnesota rise?

Mr. BAKER. Ah, Mr. Chairman, at last, at last, the Republican party, panoplied in all its glory, comes to the defense of the protective system!

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to interfere with this torrent which is flowing on so magnificently, but I am constrained to raise the point of order that under the five-minute rule a gentleman can hardly discuss other subjects than those germane to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, are we not engaged in general debate upon the state of the Union? I hope the gentleman will not be so invidious as to make the point of order. I have never heard the gentleman make it before. It seems to me the gentleman must be afraid that the arguments of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] are undermining his party foundation. In the interest of the Republican party it would be better for the gentleman to withdraw his point of

order. [Laughter.] People may understand the gentleman's motive, and if they do, it will do harm. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware of the possible misconception that may be placed upon my action, but inasmuch as I am not the guardian of the Republican party—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I do not think the point of order is well taken, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. I raise the point of order that under the five-minute rule it is not proper to discuss questions that are not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] wish to discuss the point of order?

Mr. BAKER. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BAKER. I understand I am proceeding under unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The matter under consideration in the committee is a paragraph on page 57, lines 16 to 22. The gentleman from New York raised the question in regard to the item of four inspectors.

Mr. BAKER. The existence of the indigent poor and the cause of their existence.

The CHAIRMAN. And the gentleman from New York asked unanimous consent that he might make remarks and enlarge his time in the extension of the ordinary time of five minutes. The Chair thinks the gentleman is obliged to confine his remarks to the subject before the committee.

Mr. BAKER. The existence of the indigent poor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will instruct the gentleman from New York to proceed in order.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I should not resume were it not for the fact that, whatever may be the ostensible object of the gentleman from Minnesota, I construe his raising of the point of order as a protest against my further undermining and undersapping—as the leader of the minority side has described it—the protective tariff.

Mr. Chairman, I will endeavor to confine my remarks directly to the subject before the committee—the reason of the existence in this community of the indigent poor. We are called upon to provide a large sum of money for the indigent poor, and surely, Mr. Chairman, the finding out of why the poor exist, what is the cause of their existence, what are the causes that create indigent poor in this community, is germane. Because, if we do not understand the cause which created poverty, how can we intelligently determine how much or how little money we are going to raise by indirect taxation out of the pockets of these very poor, not out of the pockets of the rich?

How can we determine how many of the poor people of this country who are now approaching poverty shall be driven further to the verge of starvation in order to provide funds that the poverty-stricken people of Washington shall be kept from starvation? Is not that germane, Mr. Chairman?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will dismiss, in deference to the desire of the gentlemen on the other side, any further reference to the protective system. I mean that I will dismiss any further reference to it as a national policy, but the idea which underlies the protective system is the same idea which creates in this and other cities land monopoly. It is the giving to a few individuals of privileges upon the plea that if they profit largely thereby, if they receive large emoluments as the result of special privileges—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will suspend. The gentleman understands, as well as the Chair, that he is not proceeding in order.

Mr. BAKER. The question I am discussing, Mr. Chairman, is certainly underlying the whole question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed in order. If the gentleman wishes to proceed in order the Chair will allow him to continue.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the indulgence of the Chair to say that I thought I was in order. I was showing the relation of cause and effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say to the gentleman from New York that the relation of cause and effect in this case seems to be so far removed that the Chair can not agree that a general discussion of all the ills of the world [laughter] is in order upon the proposition to provide for certain inspectors and the expenses in connection with them.

Mr. BAKER. Will the Chair hold, if I can show a direct connection between land speculation and the existence of the indigent poor, that it is not germane to the provision of funds in this paragraph to pay these inspectors?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hold that he will not permit the gentleman from New York to go far enough to show that. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAKER. It seems, Mr. Chairman, to be perfectly obvious that there is no desire that I shall proceed further on this matter. I have no desire to inflict myself on this House. I regard this matter as of such tremendous, such transcendent importance that the provision of money for the Army, for the Navy, for these other Departments of Government is as nothing compared with the great question of civilization—why poverty persists amid increasing wealth. Now, because I believe that, I have said what I said on this floor to-day, and if this House will not hear this cause, if they will not listen to the reason why poverty exists, if they will shut their eyes and persist in shutting their eyes to the underlying cause why it is necessary in this appropriation bill to provide hundreds of thousands of dollars for the poor in this city, I have nothing further to say, and I wash my hands of all responsibility. [Laughter and applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, in order that the country, which does want to hear, may have an opportunity, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman will stay within the same world with the subject under discussion. With that limitation I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota objects.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Oh, no; the Chairman misunderstands me. I did not intend to object. We are so fond of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER] and so fond of hearing him talk that we would go to almost any length to accommodate him.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I shall ask the House to indulge me to make a very short statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. Chairman, I can not avail myself of that privilege unless I am given the indulgence of the House for a quarter of a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will be in order. The Chairman is stating a request, and will continue doing so unless the gentleman withdraws his request.

Mr. BAKER. I withdraw the request under those circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his request. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general incidental expenses of the service, \$300.

Mr. COWHERD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I have had occasion once or twice before to criticize items of expense for the militia in the District of Columbia. I realize, of course, that this is a work of supererogation; but while gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber are making speeches against fair pay to the school-teachers and appealing for protection to the Treasury of the United States, it seems to me it might be proper to call the attention of the House to the fact that for this little territory here, less than 10 miles square, with a magnificent police force, with another Government or Capitol police force, with our third army of inspectors and park police, we are still paying over \$60,000 a year in this bill for a District militia—an amount more than many of the imperial States of the Union with ten times the population of this District are appropriating for the maintenance of their militia force. There is, as I understand it, one regiment, and we have in addition the naval reserve, whatever that may amount to, and out of these numerous items we manage to contribute \$60,000, taking it from a depleted Treasury—a Treasury that the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber are appealing to us on this side of the House to protect from the ravages of the people seeking appropriations. I submit to the gentlemen of the committee that upon any fair investigation of these items at least half of that amount might be saved to the Treasury of the United States.

I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. POWERS of Maine having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following

titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. R. 97. Joint resolution providing for the payment of the expenses of the Senate in the impeachment trial of Charles Swayne;

S. 5646. An act authorizing the construction of a wagon and electric railway bridge over the Missouri River, near Randolph, Mo.; and

S. 5902. An act for the relief of the Central Railroad Company of New Jersey.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the following, now authorized and being paid from general appropriations for the water department, namely:

For one assistant engineer, \$1,800; one assistant engineer, \$1,350; one leveler, \$1,200; two rodmen, at \$900 each; two chainmen, at \$875 each; one draftsman, \$1,050; one clerk, \$1,500; two clerks, at \$1,200 each; one storekeeper, \$900; one assistant storekeeper, \$750; one assistant foreman, \$1,275; one assistant foreman, \$1,200; one assistant foreman, \$1,125; one chief steam engineer, \$1,750; three assistant steam engineers, at \$875 each; four oilers, at \$610 each; three firemen, at \$875 each; one machinist, \$1,200; two machinists, at \$975 each; one carpenter, \$1,050; one inspector, \$1,200; one blacksmith, \$1,050; two plumbers, at \$1,050 each; one janitor, \$900; one watchman, \$875; one watchman, \$700; one watchman, \$610; two drivers, at \$700 each; one charwoman, \$150; eight inspectors, at \$750 each; one inspector, \$900; one assistant tapper, \$825; two messengers, at \$540 each; one clerk, \$1,350; one clerk, \$1,200; one clerk, \$1,050; one clerk, \$900; one driver, \$630; in all, \$54,260.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the word "one," before the word "machinist," in line 15, page 73, and insert the word "three."

Also strike out, in lines 16 and 17, page 73, the words "two machinists, at \$975 each."

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of this bill why it is that he has provided for one machinist at \$1,200 a year and then for two at \$975 a year when they are all performing the same character of work and employed at the same place in the District? As I understand it, there are but three machinists in the employ of the District, and they are employed at the pumping plant. All of them are practical, experienced machinists, and if these two men who are now allowed \$975 a year are experienced machinists and men who are fit to hold those positions they ought to receive an adequate remuneration for their services. A machinist who understands his business is worth at least \$100 a month. For the purpose of correcting this inequality and for the purpose of allowing these men fair compensation for a special character of work that requires years of experience I trust the committee will place all of these machinists upon the same basis. They are performing the same work at the same place and they all ought to receive \$100 a month.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL] I have only to say that in fixing these salaries, which we have transferred from per diem to a fixed annual salary, we have followed the recommendation of the Commissioners of the District, who have this matter in charge and who are presumed to know the situation. The committee will notice that the amendment of the gentleman from California increases salaries. We have been trying to hold salaries down, and I trust the committee will not agree to the amendment.

Mr. BELL of California. One moment. It may be true that you have followed the recommendation of the Commissioners in this respect, but the judgment and recommendation of the Commissioners is not necessarily infallible. And, while I am in favor of economy, and I think a great many people are employed in this District who ought to be discharged, which would save a great deal of money to the Government, I believe that the workmen, the skilled mechanics, the skilled workmen, ought to be well paid for their services. If you go out in private employ and take any man who is fit to be a machinist, which is a responsible position, which requires years of experience, you will find no first-class machinist working for \$975 per year. If you go out among your navy-yards in this country—the yards that are conducted by the Government, whose employees are paid by "Uncle Sam"—you will find that this remuneration is much less than that paid at the navy-yards. Those men ought to be worth \$100 per month, and I hope the committee will raise their pay to that amount. It is only \$480 in the aggregate, \$225 for each of those two men, and I trust the committee will agree to the amendment.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I desire once more to impress upon the House this thought, that the committee expects some time in the future to take up this question of the adjustment of salaries as a proposition worthy of the

attention of the committee for a whole session and make a special subject of it. It may be true, and in fact is true, that there are inequalities in the present line of salaries, including, among others, the salaries paid to teachers.

In regard to the specific item now under discussion, I will say to the committee that while these salaries may be too small and may need to be changed later, the District has no difficulty in securing the services of competent persons at the present salaries, and I trust that the committee will vote the amendment down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 18, yeas 34.

Mr. BELL of California. I ask for tellers, Mr. Chairman.

Tellers were refused, eight Members, not a sufficient number, rising in support of the demand.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are further authorized to temporarily employ such laborers, skilled mechanics, and mechanics as may be required exclusively in connection with sewer, street, and road work, or the construction and repair of buildings and bridges, or any general or special engineering or construction work, and to incur all necessary engineering and other expenses, exclusive of personal services, incidental to carrying on such work and necessary for the proper execution thereof; said laborers, skilled laborers, and mechanics to be employed to perform such work as may not be required by law to be done under contract, and to pay for such services and expenses from the appropriations under which such services are rendered and expenses incurred.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to make a verbal correction. At the foot of page 77, in line 24, transpose the word "temporarily," so it will follow the word "employ" instead of preceding it; so as to read "to employ temporarily."

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota will be agreed to. [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with amendments to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to, and accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MANN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 18123, the District appropriation bill, and had directed him to report the bill back with various amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to, and the bill as amended be passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? It not, the vote will be taken on the amendments in gross.

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McCLEARY of Minnesota, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill as amended was passed was laid on the table.

CREATING NEW DIVISION IN EASTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF MISSOURI.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill H. R. 12898, an act to create a new division in the eastern judicial district in the State of Missouri, with a Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. VANDIVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House do concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. BARTHOLOMT. Mr. Speaker, what is the motion? I did not hear it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves that the House do concur in the amendment which has been reported.

The question was taken, and the amendment was concurred in.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion of Mr. HULL, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17984) making appropriation for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and for other purposes, Mr. LACEY in the chair.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first formal reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] asks unanimous consent that the first formal reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the bill is the usual bill for appropriation for the support of the Military Academy for the year ending June 30, 1906. It carries less money this year than it has for a few years in the past.

The estimates this year were for \$726,000, in round numbers, and we appropriate \$669,000, in round numbers, or a saving of some \$56,000. The appropriation carried in the bill, I think, will meet with the approval of the committee. I know of no special matters that require explanation, and unless some other parties desire to address the committee I will ask that the Clerk proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill at length.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] very properly called to my attention an error in the printing of the bill on page 13, namely, as to the pay of an assistant plumber, in line 22. The committee had reported the bill at \$720. The printing is "\$900," which is an error in the preparation. The Clerk informs me that the total following it is the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 13, in line 22, strike out "nine hundred" and insert "seven hundred and twenty."

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, that is the purpose for which I arose.

The amendment was agreed to.

Then, on motion of Mr. HULL, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LACEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 17984) making appropriation for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that the bill as amended do pass.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 16450. An act to authorize certain changes in the permanent system of highways, District of Columbia; and

H. R. 16570. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River in Marion County, Tenn.," approved May 20, 1902.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. R. 17. Joint resolution to provide for the printing of 8,000 copies of the consolidated reports of the Gettysburg National Park Commission, 1893 to 1904, inclusive.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, also reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 9799. An act to remove charge of desertion from military record of John Dorsey;

H. R. 16802. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into contract for the collection and disposal of garbage, ashes, etc.;

H. R. 4728. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Smith;

H. R. 2871. An act to incorporate the Mutual Investment Fire Insurance Company of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 17100. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across Sunflower River in Sharkey County, Miss.; and

H. R. 17577. An act authorizing the Lindsey Lumber Company, a corporation of Escambia County, Ala., to construct a bridge across Conecuh River at or near the town of Pollard, in said county and State.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Agriculture, reported the bill (H. R. 18329) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30,

1906; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I desire to reserve all points of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] reserves all points of order on the bill.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 39 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Postmaster-General submitting an estimate of deficiency appropriation for the postal service—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending legislation to permit a refund of duties on seed wheat—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. JENKINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the House resolution (H. Res. 448) to investigate the condition of the iron and steel industry, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3978); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12646) to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the Hospital Corps of the Navy of the United States, and to define its duties and regulate its pay, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3979); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DAYTON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17254) to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to reorganize and increase the efficiency of the personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps of the United States," approved March 3, 1899, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3981); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18268) granting a pension to Annie Crawford, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3977); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the consideration of the bill (H. R. 17408) granting an increase of pension to Charley Franklin; and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JENKINS: A bill (H. R. 18327) regulating the granting of restraining orders in certain cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 18328) for the widening of a section of Columbia road east of Sixteenth street—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Agriculture:

A bill (H. R. 18329) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1906—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 207) authorizing and empowering the President of the United States to abate and suppress the continued shameful and cruel practice of killing nursing mother fur seals on the high seas now permitted and conducted—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey: A resolution (H. Res. 469) directing the Committee on the Judiciary to ascertain and report to the House certain information concerning Judge John Goodnow—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER: A bill (H. R. 18330) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Brower—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas (by request): A bill (H. R. 18331) for the relief of John J. Mullins—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 18332) for the relief of J. B. Barry—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), a bill (H. R. 18333) for the relief of Jane Lemaster—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 18334) granting an increase of pension to Hosea B. Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FIELD: A bill (H. R. 18335) granting an increase of pension to N. C. Duncan, alias M. Killian—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18336) granting an increase of pension to William Holland—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18337) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wilkerson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18338) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Kirk—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18339) granting an increase of pension to Lot Leguin Godfrey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18340) granting an increase of pension to Augustus Galen—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18341) granting an increase of pension to George Stip—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 18342) granting an increase of pension to Herman Lieb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON: A bill (H. R. 18343) granting a pension to Henry Peetsch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEFLIN: A bill (H. R. 18344) for the relief of the estate of James McDonough, deceased, late of Chambers County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 18345) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Peck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18346) providing for the issuance of patent in fee to an Indian allottee—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KEHOE: A bill (H. R. 18347) granting a pension to Martha J. Suit—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 18348) granting a pension to Alma L'Hommiedieu Ruggles—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LAWRENCE: A bill (H. R. 18349) granting an increase of pension to Albert A. Talham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 18350) granting an increase of pension to James B. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MINOR: A bill (H. R. 18351) granting an increase of pension to George W. Northedge—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 18352) granting an increase of pension to William H. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18353) for the relief of William M. White, of James County, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RODEY: A bill (H. R. 18354) granting an increase of pension to Ellen G. Timony—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 18355) granting an increase of pension to Horace A. Manley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: A bill (H. R. 18356) granting an increase of pension to Milton C. Arney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 18357) granting an in-

crease of pension to George N. Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Portland (Oreg.) Board of Trade, relative to an appropriation for the Cello Canal—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BAKER: Petition of the National Business League of Chicago, favoring National Government regulation of freight rates—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BEALL of Texas: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Jane Lemaster, of Dallas, Tex.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BONYNGE: Petition of Mrs. B. F. Jones et al., against legislation relative to Sabbath observance in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DAVIS of Florida: Petition of citizens of Lake Butler, Fla., favoring an enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Interlachen, Fla., favoring enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Florahome, Fla., favoring an enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DEEMER: Petition of J. H. Bennett et al., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of Mrs. W. N. Sherlock et al., against legislation relative to Sabbath observance in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of D. McClay et al., against legislation relative to Sabbath observance in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FIELD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of George Skip, of Davilla, Tex.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Augustus Graylen, of Brazos County, Tex.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of L. L. Godfrey, of Kosse, Tex.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas O. Kirk, of Milan County, Tex.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James Wilkinson, of Brazos County, Tex.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of William Holland, of Dawson, Tex.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of N. C. Duncan, of Wheelock, Tex.—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of United Chinese Societies of Honolulu, against exclusion of Chinese from Hawaii—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Cigar Makers' International Union, opposing reduction of tariff on Philippine cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Denver Chamber of Commerce, opposing any reduction of tariff on beet sugar—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of the Lake Torpedo Boat Company, of Bridgeport, Conn., seeking such action as Congress may deem just and proper in submarine boat affairs in the United States—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HITT: Petition of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen of Fulton, Ill., favoring passage of bill H. R. 7041—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition of the American Association of Masters and Pilots of Steam Vessels, in session at Washington, D. C., favoring Government acquirement of the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. KYLE: Petition of citizens of Troy, Ohio, favoring international peace—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolution of the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, against admission of New Mexico and Arizona as one State—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of the Alpena (Mich.) Retail Druggists' Association, indorsing the Mann patent bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. LUCKING: Petition of citizens of the First Congressional district of Michigan, favoring a constitutional amendment prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAHON: Petition of Robert T. Decker et al., favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of the county of Mifflin, Pa., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 210, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Ickesburg, Pa., for restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of James B. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of various churches of Mifflin County, Pa., favoring bill H. R. 4072—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER: Petition of citizens of Burlington, Kans., against legislation relative to Sabbath observance in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for the relief of William H. Smith, of Chattanooga, Tenn.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURDOCK: Petition of G. S. Culner et al., of Spivey, Kans., against legislation on Sabbath observance in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of citizens of Rush County, Kans., against legislation on Sabbath observance in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NEEDHAM: Petition of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, advocating recession of Yosemite and Mariposa big tree groves to Government protection—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, against tax on brandy used in the fortification of wine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the Manufacturers and Producers' Association of California, asking an appropriation for additional tug service in San Francisco Harbor—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OTJEN: Petition of Mrs. W. J. Allen and others, of the Home Missionary Society of the Washington Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, Milwaukee, Wis., against liquor traffic in Indian territories—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of citizens of Auburn, N. Y., favoring bill H. R. 13778—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PORTER: Petition of Mrs. Graham et al., against repeal of present canteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mrs. Graham et al., favoring passage of the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mrs. Samuel Hamilton et al., favoring re-Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Mrs. Samuel Hamilton et al., favoring the tentation of the present canteen law—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mrs. J. M. Foster et al., against repeal of the canteen law—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Mrs. J. M. Foster et al., favoring the Hepburn-Dolliver bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Andrew J. Schrimsher, of Madison County, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of C. Tressett & Sons, of Fort Wayne, Ind., favoring the Quarles-Cooper bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RUPPERT: Resolution of the thirty-sixth legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, against admission of Arizona and New Mexico as one State—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Petition of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the First Presbyterian Church of Grand Rapids, Mich., favoring an amendment to the Constitution prohibiting polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the Grand Rapids Fruit Growers' Association, favoring enlargement of the powers of the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Resolution of the thirty-sixth legislative assembly of New Mexico, against new Mexico and Arizona being admitted as one State—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. VAN VOORHIS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Melton C. Arney, of Zanesville, Ohio—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.